DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES
INVOLVED IN CURRICULUM CHANGE
AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS
IN FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

BY

SANDRA W. SCAGGS

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A doctoral thesis represents the culmination of years of study and preparation during which many persons provide support and inspiration. I wish to thank Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, my committee chairman, and Dr. James Hale for their patient guidance and concern, and Dr. Kern Alexander and Dr. James Hensel for their supervisory support. Deep appreciation goes to Dr. M. Y. Nunnery whose special brand of encouragement kept me on task during the writing of the thesis and to Dr. James W. Longstreth for periodic and much needed morale boosts.

I am also indebted to the good friends who provided companionship, support, and encouragement during my doctoral studies, especially Dr. Susan Acker, Theresa Vernetson, Dr. Sheila Appleby, Dr. Johanna White, and David Paterno.

Deepest gratitude and love go to my husband, Jim, who never let me lose sight of the goal; to my children, Sam and Shawn, who suffered disruption of their lives with patience and understanding; to my parents, Dale and Lela Wineland, from whom I learned to believe in myself.

I wish finally to express my sincere appreciation to my typists, Alice Price who transformed illegible handwritten copy into a first draft and Peggy Paschall who rescued the entire endeavor at the last minute, and to Greg Harris whose efforts kept miles off my car and soles on my shoes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vii

ABSTRACT xi

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

The Problem 4
  Statement of the Problem 4
  Specific Questions 4
  Delimitations 5
  Limitations 7
  Justification for the Study 7
Definitions 9
Procedures 12
  The Survey Approach 12
  Selection of the Sample 13
    Community Colleges 13
    Study Participants 14
  The Survey Instrument 15
  Data Collection 17
  Data Analysis 18
Organization of the Research Report 22
Summary 22

II REVIEW OF RELATED THEORY, RESEARCH AND EXPERT OPINION 24

The Process of Change in Organizations 24
  Individualistic Bias of Students of Change 25
  Background from Organizational Theory 30
  Two-Dimensional Behavior in Organizations.. 35
The Decision-Making Function in Organizations 41

CHAPTER PAGE

Decision Making as a Process 42
Organizational Goals vs. Personal Values 43
Curriculum Decision vs. Funding Decision . 47
Faculty Decision Making Sphere vs. Administrative Decision Making Sphere 49
Normative vs. Bureaucratic Governance Structures 54
Faculty vs. Administrator Orientation to the Organization 56
The Formal vs. the Informal Organization.. 60
Social Perception and Understanding Decision Making 64
Summary 68

III PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS 69

Perceptions As To Final Decision Maker 69
Findings for All Colleges 69
President as final decision maker 70
Number of different final decision makers named 78
Faculty as final decision maker 81
"Don't know final decision maker" responses 82
Findings for Colleges Grouped by Size 84
President as final decision maker 84
Number of different final decision makers named 88
Faculty as final decision maker 95
"Don't know final decision maker" responses 96
Findings for Colleges Grouped by Organizational Type 99
President as final decision maker 101
Number of different final decision makers named 105
Faculty as final decision maker 108
"Don't know final decision maker" responses 109
Perceptions as to Number of Other Participants 111
Findings for All Colleges 111
"No other participants" responses 111
Number of other participants 114
Findings for Colleges Grouped by Size 116
"No other participants" responses 118
Number of other participants 119

CHAPTER PAGE

Findings for Colleges Grouped by Organizational Type 123
"No other participants" responses 126
Number of other participants 126
Summary 134

IV ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS 136

Rationale For Analysis 136
All Respondents and All Colleges 138
Final Decision Maker 138
Other Participants 138
Final Decision Maker--Status Group Comparison 141
Other Participants--Status Group Comparison 143
Colleges Grouped by Size 144
Final Decision Maker--Status Group Comparison 145
Other Participants--Status Group Comparison 147
Colleges Grouped by Organizational Type 149
Final Decision Maker--Status Group Comparison 149
Number of Participants--Status Group Comparison 151
Comparison by Type of Decision 153
Number of Different Final Decision Makers Named 153
Number of Other Participants Named 154
Summary 155

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS 156

Summary 156
Conclusions and Implications 161
Recommendations 163

APPENDIX

A QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTERS 166

B COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY 172

REFERENCES 175

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 181

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Perceived Final Decision-Maker By Decision	71
2	Final Decision Maker Choices For All Colleges And All Respondents	75
3	Perception Of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Business Officers And All Respondents	77
4	Perception Of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Faculty And All Respondents	78
5	Number Of Different Final Decision-Makers Named By Status And By Decision..	80
6	Numbers Of Final Decision-Makers Named By Status: Extension Of The Median Test	81
7	Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions - Frequency Distributions	82
8	Perceptions Of Faculty As Final Decision Maker Comparing Faculty And All Respondents	83
9	Response of "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Comparing Faculty And All Respondents	83
10	Final Decision Maker By Size	85
11	Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker By Size	87
12	Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker By Size And By Status....	87

LIST OF TABLES - CONTINUED

TABLE PAGE

13 Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker By Size And By Status 89

14 Choice Of President, Vice President Or Academic Dean As Final Decision Maker By College Size 91

15 Number Of Different Decision-Makers Named By Size And By Status 92

16 Numbers Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Size 93

17 Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Status And By Size: Frequency Distributions 94

18 Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Size: Medians For Instructional And Funding Decisions 96

19 Perceptions Of Faculty As Final Decision Maker Comparing Faculty To All Respondents By College Size 97

20 "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses By College Size 99

21 "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Faculty And All Respondents By College Size 100

22 "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Small, Medium And Large College Faculty 101

23 Perceived Final Decision Maker By Organizational Type 102

24 Choice Of President, Vice President, Or Academic Dean As Final Decision Maker By Organizational Type 104

25 Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Chairmen By Organizational Type 105

26 Number of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Type, By Status, And By Decision. 106

LIST OF TABLES - CONTINUED

TABLE		PAGE
27	Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Organization Type	107
28	Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named: Medians For Instructional And Funding Decisions By Organizational Type .	108
29	"Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Response By Organizational Type	109
30	"Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Faculty And All Respondents By Organizational Type	110
31	"Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Multicampus Faculty And Single Campus Faculty	110
32	Number Of Participants Named: All Colleges And All Decisions By Status	112
33	"No Other Participants" Responses Comparing Status Groups For All Decisions And All Colleges	113
34	Number Of Other Participants Named: All Colleges And All Decisions Comparing Status Levels	115
35	Number Of Participants Named By Type Of Decision: Frequency Distributions	116
36	Number Of Participants Named By Type Of Decision Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions	116
37	Number Of Participants Named For All Decisions By Size And By Status	117
38	"No Other Participants" Responses For All Decisions By Size Group	118
39	Number Of Other Participants Named For All Decisions Comparing Medians For Small, Medium And Large	120
40	Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Faculty Medians By Size	121

LIST OF TABLES - CONTINUED

TABLE PAGE

41 Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Faculty Medians And All Respondent Medians By Size 122

42 Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Medians For Presidents By Size ... 123

43 Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Size - Frequency Distribution .. 124

44 Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Size 125

45 Number Of Participants Named For All Decisions By Organizational Type And By Status 127

46 "No Other Participants" Responses Comparing All Status Groups By Organizational Type 128

47 "No Other Participants" Responses Comparing Business Officers By Multicampus And Single Campus Colleges 129

48 Number Of Other Participants Named By Organizational Type Comparing Status Medians For Multi- And Single Campus 130

49 Number Of Participants Named Comparing Multicampus And Single Campus Department Chairmen, Business Officers, And Presidents 132

50 Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Organizational Type: Frequency Distributions 133

51 Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Organizational Type 134

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES INVOLVED IN CURRICULUM CHANGE AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS IN FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Sandra W. Scaggs

March, 1980

Chairman: Dr. James L. Wattenbarger
Major Department: Educational Administration and Supervision

The problem in this study was to determine perceptions of faculty and administrators in Florida community colleges relative to two aspects of decision making as applied to curriculum change: (1) decisions which require assessment of the curriculum or instructional value of a proposed change and (2) decisions which have to do primarily with fund allocations to support a curriculum change. Data analysis was concerned with identifying differences in response patterns based on comparisons by status group, college size, organizational type, and decision type. Status group designations wer faculty, department chairmen, business officers, academic vice presidents, and presidents; size groups, small, medium, and large; organizational type groups, single campus and multicampus; and decision type groups, curriculum and funding.

The research was conducted by mail survey using a modified version of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument developed and first used by Glen Eye and associates in 1966. The questionnaire was sent to presidents, academic vice presidents, and chief business officers in all 28 Florida community colleges. Two department chairmen and four faculty members in each college, chosen at random from faculty rosters, also received questionnaires. Data analysis was based on 150 completed questionnaires, a return rate of over 60%, which were received by the deadline. Data were analyzed using frequency distributions, crosstabulations and statistical tests. Pearson's Chi-Square, the Median Test and the Extension of the Median Test at the .05 level of confidence were applied to appropriate data configurations to test significance of differences in response patterns.

Analysis of the data revealed the following differences in perceptions:

1. By all measures, faculty perceptions were significantly different from those of all other status groups.

2. Generally, faculty were significantly less in agreement as to the locus of decision-making authority, significantly more likely to indicate they did not know the identity of the final decision maker, significantly more likely to indicate they did not know the identity of the final decision maker, significantly less likely to perceive decision making as highly participative, and significantly more likely to perceive decisions as being made unilaterally than other respondents.

3. College size was the only variable other than status which appeared to be associated with major differences in perceptions. In small colleges, smaller status differences were found on most measures than in medium and large colleges, and perceptions of all respondents in small colleges tended to be significantly different than those of all respondents in medium and large colleges on most measures.

4. The number of participants in decision making named by all respondents was associated with the type of decision. Curriculum decisions were perceived to involve significantly more input from various groups and persons than were funding decisions.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

"Changing the curriculum, it has been said, is like moving a graveyard" (Hefferlin, 1969, p. 18). And, as Hefferlin expands the analogy, the purely physical effort fades before the questions of sanctity and sacrilege. The feelings and philosophical position of everyone even remotely connected with the proposed change not only must be considered, but respected (p. 18).

If each viewpoint regarding a specific curriculum change is given due consideration, however, the processes involved in deciding to make a change can become time consuming and complicated as more and more people are asked for input. Yet rapid changes in technology and in societal expectations for educational institutions create a strong need for flexibility in curriculum offerings.

According to Wattenbarger and Scaggs (1979), the educational institution which would seem most likely to be oriented to curriculum change, and indeed probably is, is the community college. They suggest that by virtue of its role as an institution of life-long learning, it could be expected to have well developed organizational mechanisms for implementation of the minor kinds of curriculum change which would be necessary to meet the changing needs and desires of its varied student body. Such curriculum changes frequently would involve apparently simple modifications like the addition of a new course or the insertion of modular units of instruction within existing courses. Logically, such changes would appear to disturb the organization little and to require the cooperation of few people, thus diminishing the problems connected with questions of "sanctity and sacrilege" (p. 3).

This thesis is strongly questioned, however, by those instructors in community colleges who have attempted to initiate even minor structural curriculum changes. They agree that there is freedom to modify the content of courses already being taught, but as soon as a proposed change requires institutional approval, or cooperative arrangements among instructors, the situation, it is asserted, changes dramatically. "Adding a course to the curriculum in my college is almost impossible" is a frequently heard comment when discussing instructor-initiated curriculum change attempts.

At the same time, curriculum offerings in community colleges do change. Obviously, there is some strategy which can be used to effect successful curriculum change. Further, since the problem seems to arise when a proposed change is introduced into the formal system, the logical conclusion must be that there is some facet of the organizational process, or the perceptions of organization members of the process, that has great influence on the implementation of curriculum change. The central thesis of this research is that investigation of decision-making procedures and the perceptions of organization members about those procedures may provide useful information regarding organizational influences on efforts to change the curriculum.

Several important questions are raised by consideration of decision making as a major process in the implementation of curriculum change. Is there, for example, congruence of perceptions at various levels of the organization about who has the effective responsibility for the final decision about a proposed change? Do affected organization members know enough about the process to be able to identify those persons or groups whose input is important in the consideration of a proposed curriculum change?

If one accepts the contention of prominent organizational theorists that decision making is the critical activity of an organization (Dill, 1962), p. 29; Feldman & Kanter, 1965, p. 615; Robbins, 1976, p. 152; Simons, 1947), then understanding the perceptions maintained by various members of an educational institution about the functioning of that process would appear to be essential to successful change attempts. To illustrate, a faculty member who wishes to offer a new course of instruction may be reluctant to attempt to gain organizational approval for the new course based on a perception of the decision-making process which overestimates the difficulties involved, or the amount of time required to accomplish the change. An understanding, therefore, of who believes what about the entire process leading to implementation of curriculum change seems essential if successful change is to be accomplished.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to describe and compare the perceptions of role incumbents in several selected status groups in Florida community colleges with reference to (a) the locus of selected curriculum decisions and (b) the total number of persons who participate in the selected decisions.

Specific Questions

To aid in investigation of the problem, answers to the following specific questions were sought.

1. Are perceptions of organization members in different status groups in agreement as to the location of final authority for decisions regarding selected types of curriculum change?

2. Are perceptions of organization members in different status groups in agreement as to the number of

persons or groups who are involved in decisions regarding selected types of curriculum change?

3. Is the size of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the location of final authority for decisions and/or the number of persons who are involved in decisions?

4. Is the organizational type of the organization related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the location of final authority for decisions and/or the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions?

5. Is the type of decision related to perceptions of organization members regarding the location of final authority for decisions and/or the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions?

The data collected to answer these questions provided the basis for a description of the perceptions of institutional members about decision-making processes as they related to selected types of curriculum change in Florida community colleges. The descriptive data were further analyzed to discover significant differences between variables.

Delimitations

The following confinements were applicable to the study:

1. Data collection was limited to a mail survey of the 28 community colleges which comprise the Florida community college system.

2. The data collected were confined to perceptions of the following role incumbents as expressed by their responses to the Decision Process Analysis Instrument:

    A. College presidents;
    B. College academic vice presidents or deans (chief academic administrators);
    C. College administrative vice presidents or comptrollers (chief business administrators);
    D. Selected department chairmen; and
    E. Selected faculty members.

3. The data collected were confined to perceptions about decisions on the following specific types of curriculum changes:

    A. The decision to create a new credit course;
    B. The decision to fund a new credit course;
    C. The decision to change the content of a credit course;
    D. The decision to fund the change of content of a credit course;
    E. The decision to create a new noncredit course;
    F. The decision to fund a new noncredit course;
    G. The decision to change the delivery system for a course, credit or noncredit;
    H. The decision to fund a change in the delivery system for a course, credit or noncredit;
    I. The decision to change graduation requirements.

4. The Decision Process Analysis Instrument was designed to collect perceptual impressions about the formal process for reaching decisions on curriculum changes from selected persons in Florida community colleges. It is, therefore, not possible to assert that aggregated data can be used to describe the actual decision-making process in any participating institution.

Limitations

The confinements noted in connection with this study produced the following limitations:

1. Since the institutions and, to a large extent, the individuals surveyed were selected rather than randomly chosen, conclusions based on analysis of the data were not generalized to community colleges which were not a part of the study.

2. The survey instrument used was a modification of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument developed by Glen Eye and his associates in their 1966 USOE Cooperative Research Project (Eye, Gregg, Lipham, Netzer, & Francke, 1966). Modifications necessary to adapt Eye's instrument to use in this study were not major but nonetheless substantial enough to cause the validity of the Decision Process Analysis Instrument to be limited to face validity.

Justification for the Study

Changes in organizations are commonly seen to be initiated at a top administrative level.

> When change in an organization does occur, it will tend to occur from the top down, not from the bottom up . . . . The structure makes change from the bottom up very difficult; one would expect little if any change to be introduced this way. (Griffiths, 1964, p. 435)

Nation's study of curriculum change appeared to confirm the belief. Participants in her study were asked to identify the origination point of change in their educational institutions. "The usual reply as to where most changes came from was, 'From the top'" (Nation, 1967, p. 168). She concluded that "the part played by administrators and supervisors in creating a desirable climate for change and in facilitating the process has received much attention. The role of the individual teacher appears to be very insignificant, especially in promoting change outside his classroom" (p. 25).

While the pattern of change which begins at the top and filters to the bottom may have historical and logical reasons for existence, there were questions about the appropriateness of rigid adherence to such a pattern in post-secondary educational institutions, in which the bottom hierarchical level is comprised of highly skilled professionals. It appeared that in such organizations, changes in curriculum should be as likely to be initiated at the instructor level as at the academic administrator level.

Informal conversations with community college administrators and faculty members disclosed an interesting dichotomy of perceptions about such an assumption, however.

Administrators generally indicated that suggestions for curriculum change were treated with equal regard without consideration of where they had originated. Conversely, faculty tended to mention bureaucratic delays, lack of serious consideration, and funding problems which discouraged them from even suggesting changes.

Yet curriculum change does occur. It may actually be, as widely supposed, that administrators, who have power to make decisions and control funds, do impose curriculum changes from their level. It may be, however, that high level academic administrators act to fill a void created by faculty members whose perceptions of faculty roles in the change process are inaccurate. It may also be that administrators have faulty perceptions regarding the openness of the system to input from the faculty level.

This study was designed to investigate the possibility that perceptual differences among persons at different levels in community colleges may in fact be a serious hindrance to the ability of an institution to adapt its curriculum rapidly and effectively.

Definitions

Change. "To make different in some particular - to alter" (Webster, 1971, p. 139). "In the field of education, however, the connotation of the word includes the concept of betterment or improvement" (Eye et al., 1966, p. 9).

Curriculum. "The courses offered by an educational institution or one of its branches" (Webster, 1971, p. 204). "All the courses which a school offers" (Oliver, 1965, p. 5).

Chief academic administrator. Position reporting directly to the college president with direct responsibility for curriculum and instruction functions of the college. For example, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Instruction, Vice President for Instruction.

Chief business officer. Position reporting directly to the college president with direct responsibility for the business and financial functions of the college. For example, Vice President for Business Affairs, Vice President for Administration, Comptroller, Business Manager.

Curriculum change. The alteration of the course offerings of a community college. Operationally, the addition of a credit course, the radical modification in content of an existing course, the addition of a new or existing course to the requirements for graduation, and the interdisciplinary use of single curriculum-area instructional modules.

Institutional size. Colleges categorized by total full-time equivalent (FTE) students for 1977-78 into small, medium and large groups.

Locus of decision. The organizational position with formal authority to make final decisions affecting the organization. Also, the role incumbent of that position.

Participation. Operationally, the act of being officially involved in making curriculum change decisions.

Perception. "Any insight, knowledge, or intuitive judgment arrived at by perceiving" (Funk & Wagnall, 1975, p. 1000). As used herein, the term refers to "social perception" which is "crucially determined by the specific character or state of the individual perceiver" (Bartley, 1969, p. 421). Also, "that part of living by which each one of us, from his own particular point of view, creates for himself the world within which he has his life's experiences and through which he strives to gain his satisfaction" (Griffiths, 1959, p. 84).

Organizational type. Colleges categorized by type of administrative operation into single campus or multicampus groups.

Status group. A descriptive label used to refer to one or more of the five categories of respondents. For example, "faculty" is a status group, as is "president."

Type of decision. Decision items on the questionnaire were of two types: decisions which require instructional or curriculum consideration and decisions which require fund availability or allocation consideration.

Procedures

Since the study was to be primarily descriptive in nature, it was important to collect data from a relatively large number of respondents. Therefore, a mailed questionnaire survey was used. The survey instrument was mailed to a selected group of Florida community college administrators and faculty along with a cover letter from the committee chairman (Appendix A). Coded data from the questionnaire were tabulated and crosstabulated using appropriate programs from Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975). Crosstabulation data were subjected to statistical analysis to determine significant differences between variables.

The Survey Approach

As was discussed in the introductory section of this report, there was reason to believe that the administrative processes leading to implementation of curriculum change tended to be perceived differently depending on the organizational perspective of professionals in community colleges. Consideration of research requirements for the study led to the decision to use the survey approach.

First, sufficient data for accurate description of the population and for statistical analysis of the data had to be generated. Second, data which were based on perceptions of organization members were necessary. Both requirements had to be satisfied in order to draw conclusions about the accuracy of the central thesis: that there tend to be perceptual differences among community college professionals about the processes involved in curriculum changes. A questionnaire survey met both requirements. As Whyte (1971) pointed out, the questionnaire survey "is particularly suitable for studies of attitudes, values, beliefs, and perceptions of informants" and, in addition, "lends itself readily to quantification" (p. 48). The appropriateness of the questionnaire survey for this study was further affirmed by Fox (1969) in his discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire as a data gathering device.

> Since the questions are on paper and the interaction impersonal, the questionnaire technique brings with it both advantages of that interaction: relatively inexpensive mass coverage of potential respondents and complete standardization of the instructions to which the respondents are exposed. Moreover, the ability to include all response formats provides the researcher with great flexibility in the nature of the information sought. (p. 548)

Selection of the Sample

Community colleges. The study was intended to describe differences in perceptions among professional employees at different hierarchical levels in Florida community colleges. Since this represented a finite population, all 28 public community colleges in the State of Florida were included in the survey.

Study participants. A questionnaire was mailed to persons who held each of the following positions in each of the 28 colleges surveyed:

1. The president
2. The chief academic administrator
3. The chief business officer
4. Department chairmen (two in each college)
5. Faculty members (four in each college)

In order to personalize the mail contact and thus, it was hoped, stimulate a larger response, questionnaires were mailed to each participant by name. Names and addresses were obtained from faculty and administrator rosters in the 1978-79 catalogs for each college. In the case of colleges which publish catalogs biannually, the most recent publication was used.

The choice of positions to be surveyed was based on logic. The president, the chief academic administrator, and the chief business officer appeared to be obvious choices because of their customary involvement in decisions about allocation of funds as well as in those decisions having to do with courses and programs of study. It seemed equally apparent that department chairmen and faculty would normally have some official role in curriculum decisions affecting their own areas, at least.

The decision to survey more than one department chairman and one faculty member in each college was made in an attempt to insure at least minimal representativeness of responses at those levels. A table of random numbers was used in conjunction with appropriate rosters in the college catalogs to obtain the necessary names.

The Survey Instrument

The development of the survey instrument depended on several considerations.

1. The primary disadvantages of the questionnaire survey method had to be overcome to the extent possible. Those disadvantages, according to Fox (1969) were (a) "the necessity to be able to state the questions in advance so that their intent is clear without additional interpretation and explanation" and (b) "the real danger that only a small proportion of respondents will return the questionnaire" (p. 548).

2. In consideration of the problem, data which were clearly perceptual rather than factual in nature were required.

3. Since collection of large amounts of data was planned, the instrument had to be designed so as to facilitate computer analysis of the data.

Fortunately, the literature search disclosed the Decision Point Analysis Instrument which had been developed by Glen Eye and his associates (1966) to collect data of a similar nature. Modifying an already-tested and validated instrument rather than developing one independently facilitated satisfaction of two of the essential considerations for development of the instrument: the need to indicate clearly that perceptions of beliefs were sought rather than hard facts and the necessity to phrase questions so that the respondent had no need for interpretation or explanation.

A return rate of 60% in each category of participant was determined to be adequate for the purposes of the study. Given the response format of the instrument, it appeared highly unlikely that even 50% nonresponders could have affected the response pattern. However, Fox (1969) suggested that from his experience, "when the proportion falls below 60%, the data are fragile" (p. 346); therefore, the 60% figure was used in this study.

In order to encourage a 60% response, several steps were taken. First, as was mentioned before, the questionnaire was sent directly to each respondent by name. Second, the cover letter indicated that a separate card was included for the purpose of requesting a summary of results of the study. Third, by precoding the questionnaire it was possible to reassure participants that vigorous measures would be taken to maintain their anonymity. Fourth, self-addressed and stamped envelopes were included in the packet. Finally, the fixed-response format of the questionnaire and the perceptual nature of the information requested produced an instrument which required little time for response.

The final consideration in development of the instrument, that it produce data amenable to computer analysis, was met by precoding the questionnaires and by designing the item format for easily coded responses. The demographic variables (college, organizational type, size, and respondents' organizational position) were precoded. Possible responses to the questions were highly structured for ease of coding.

The Decision Process Analysis Instrument, along with the cover letter, instructions, request-for-summary card, and follow-up letter comprise Appendix A.

Data Collection

Survey packets were mailed with a request that they be returned within two weeks. Three weeks after the initial mailing, two categories of participants had not yet reached the 60% return level originally established. A second letter requesting participation in the survey was mailed along with duplicate survey materials to all persons who had not yet responded. As a result of the second mailing, the final response levels in each category were as follows:

Presidents	71%
Chief Academic Administrators	89%
Chief Business Officers	64%
Department Chairmen	65%
Faculty	57%
TOTAL--all categories	65%

While the faculty category did not reach the 60% level, the sample chosen represented roughly 10% of the total faculty in the 28 colleges and the returned questionnaires represented approximately 5.5%. The actual number of returns was 62, which is considered a statistically large sample (Fox, 1969, p. 347). The 57% return rate for the faculty category was therefore accepted as usable.

Returned questionnaires totaled 154. Of those, one was returned blank and three others were received too late to be included in the study. A total of 150 questionnaires provided data for analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were first inspected using frequency distributions and percentages. Since a major purpose of the study was to determine differences between certain variables, however, statistical tests for identifying any such variances were also necessary.

The design of the data gathering instrument produced data which could be treated as either nominal or ordinal. When naming the final decision maker, for example, respondents had to choose one of 13 titles. At the simplest level, this was nominal, or categorical, data. Chi-square, a statistical test appropriate for measurement on a nominal scale, was therefore selected. The chi-square test was appropriate for use with nominal data because it focuses on frequencies in categories; i.e., on enumerative data (Seigel, 1956, p.23), and because it can be used in "tests of independence (or lack of statistical association) between categorical attributes" (Hays, 1963, p. 589). In addition, as Hays also pointed out:

> Probabilities arrived at using this statistic [chi-square] are approximately the same as the exact multinomial probabilities we would like to be able to find for samples as much or more deviant from expectation as the sample obtained. The larger the sample N, the better should this approximation be. (p. 583)

Since the study sample numbered 150 and each participant answered nine questions, the N for the chi-square test was sometimes as large or larger than 1350. Because its approximation to the normal curve increases as N grows larger, chi-square was judged to be the most appropriate test for the nominal data in the study.

As data analysis proceeded, it became clear that answers to some of the research questions could be most readily obtained by organizing the data so as to produce a configuration amenable to ordinal, or ranking, measurement. For example, due to the wide range of perceptual differences regarding the locus of final decision-making authority (as many as nine different final decision-makers were named for a single decision), it was more meaningful to look at the number of different decision-makers named by status category than to simply assign categories. This produced a configuration which clearly displayed an ordering property; i.e., more than and less than.

With the data organized in such fashion, some measure of central tendency was required before analysis could be made. Since the questionnaire required responses in discrete categories, no underlying continuity of values could be claimed. Therefore, the arithmetic mean, the computation of which does assume underlying continuity, was judged inappropriate as a measure of central tendency for the data. Instead the median, which permits ordering of data without the assumption of underlying continuity, was used as the measure of central tendency. Because the median "is a point on a scale such that half the observations fall above it and half below it" (Ferguson, 1966, p. 54), its use allows for statements of not only equality and difference of values, but also statements of "greater than" or "less than." It does not provide the necessary information for precise statements about how much more or how much less, however.

Medians were calculated using the following formula taken from Ferguson (1966):

$$\text{Median} = L + \left(\frac{N/2 - F}{f_m}\right)h$$

where L = exact lower limit of interval containing the median

F = sum of all frequencies below L

f_m = frequency of interval containing median

N = number of cases

h = class interval (p. 55)

To test status differences in those cases in which there was ordinal scaling, two tests based on the chi-square test were used. The median test (Ferguson, 1966, pp. 355-356) was used for 2 x 2 contingency tables, the extension of the median test (pp. 357-358) for k x 2 tables. Both tests compare the medians of two independent samples with null hypothesis that no difference exists between the median for the populations from which the samples were drawn. "The median test is based on the idea that in two samples drawn from the same population the expectation is that as many observations in each sample will fall above as below the joint median" (p. 355).

More specific discussions of statistical procedures are included in Chapter III where necessary.

Organization of the Research Report

Chapter II is a review of related theory, research, and expert opinion.

Chapter III is a presentation of the findings of the study which are directly related to the specific questions under investigation. It includes the results of all statistical analyses.

Chapter IV offers an analysis of the findings reported in Chapter III.

In Chapter V are offered conclusions drawn from the findings, implications for curriculum change efforts in Florida community colleges, and recommendations for future research.

Summary

Because of accelerating pace of change in the modern technological world, educational institutions must be prepared to cope with rapidly changing curriculum needs. Experience, however, teaches that curriculum change is usually difficult and slow rather than well planned and easily effected.

The initial assumption which provided impetus for the study was that education professionals in different status groups tend to perceive differently the processes involved in curriculum change, and further, that such perceptual differences may be associated with discouragement, delays, and frustration when attempts are made to initiate curriculum change. The survey design was chosen in order to generate large quantities of data which could be used to describe the nature of any such perceptual differences found among professional employees in the 28 Florida community colleges.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED THEORY, RESEARCH, AND EXPERT OPINION

This chapter provides a theoretical context for the research reported herein. It is divided into three major sections. The first section is a discussion of change in organizations, and its relationship to decision making in organizations. The second part is an analysis of decision making as a major organizational function and its importance to the change process. The final section deals with the barriers to change which can exist as a result of uncertain perceptions about the important influence organizational decision-making procedures have on the change process.

The Process of Change in Organizations

The ultimate goal of the change process is to arrive at a set of conditions and/or attitudes which are different than they were when change began. The process of changing attitudes, however, is usually complex and difficult. Authorities on change, in fact, agreed that change was strenuously resisted by many, if not most, of the people who would be affected by it. It "represents a departure from existing ways and means of doing things and thus result in a change in the pattern of relationships within a system" (Hobbs, 1966, p. 20). That "change in the pattern of relationships within a system" was identified as the key to understanding the phenomenon of change in an organization.

Individualistic Bias of Students of Change

Early authorities on the process of change tended to stress the kinds of change which were a product of technological advances and which affected individuals. Rogers (1962), one of the first authors to attempt a theory on diffusion and adoption of innovations, was concerned almost exclusively with the processes involved in the adoption of technological change. His theory of diffusion was based on an analysis of 506 studies undertaken during the 1940's and 1950's. Those studies dealt with diverse innovations such as smallpox inoculation, birth-control methods, high-draft spinning equipment, and use of fertilizers, weed sprays and bulk milk tanks by farmers (p. 5).

After reviewing these studies, Rogers proposed a theory to account for individual acceptance or rejection of innovations which came to be referred to as the diffusion theory of innovation. He identified five necessary stages in the process of adoption: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption (p. 81). Rogers also identified five "adoptor categories" to describe individuals in terms of their relative willingness to accept and implement innovation. Those categories were labeled innovator, early adopter, early majority, late majority and laggard (pp. 168-171).

Two characteristics were common to all of the research reviewed by Rogers--the innovations were of a technological nature and the changes required for adoption of those innovations had their roots in that technological nature. In addition, the kinds of innovations which Rogers studied had as a basic assumption the freedom of the individual to decide independently whether or not to adopt an innovation.

In the 1940's and 1950's, the growth of organizational bureaucracy had only begun; therefore, the picture of the free individual who could decide for himself whether to use a new fertilizer or recommend a smallpox vaccination to his patients was reasonably accurate. In fact, throughout the late 1950's and early 1960's, educational authorities on change apparently accepted the "free individual assumption" as a useful way to analyze the success or failure of attempts to introduce innovations into educational institutions (Carolson, 1965; Eichholz & Rogers, 1964; Hobbs, 1966; March & Simon, 1965; Miles, 1964; Mort, 1954). Further, there appeared to have been a strong tendency to draw analogies from the individual as innovator to the educational institution as innovator. That is, most change experts of the period were willing to assume that within the framework of the diffusion theory, institutions behaved like individuals.

Mort (1954), for example, explained the varying ability of local school districts to adapt in the following way:

> Local school districts vary in their ability to adapt. Some are pioneers, some early followers, some late followers, and some laggards . . . . Regardless of the many legal and social factors which tend to make some school districts more adaptable than others, the fact remains that adaptability is the product of the action of individuals. (p. 2)

One question, of course, was: Are institutions like individuals in their reactions to change? Is the "product of the action of individuals" likely to be similar to the action of a single individual? Authors of the 1950's and 1960's responded in the affirmative. Ross (1958) and Mort (1954) each reviewed hundreds of research studies related to change. The studies reviewed by Mort did not necessarily involve educational changes while those reviewed by Ross were limited to change in educational institutions. Yet both authors use the same terminology and the same general theoretical concepts. They both refer to diffusion and dissemination, to lag time, to invention and adoption. While Mort analyzed the personal characteristics of those individuals who fit Rogers' five adopter categories, Ross analyzed district and community characteristics of educational institutions which appeared to fall into similar categories.

In their 1957 textbook, Principles of School Administration, Mort and Ross introduced the concept of adaptability which they defined as "the capacity of an organism (in this case, a school system) to change to meet new developments both in the setting which conditions operations and purpose and in the technology basic to its method" (p. 210). This further analogy between the actions of an individual human being and the actions of a group of human beings organized into an educational institution, while entirely defensible from a systems theory viewpoint, nonetheless contained conceptual flaws when the interest in change was operational rather than theoretical.

Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein (1971) challenged the usefulness of the diffusion theory as applied to change in organizations on the basis of certain assumptions inherent in the theory.

> We believe, however, that this model has little use in explaining the success or failure of the implementation of innovations in schools or other types of organizations. Its lack of utility is due to certain of its assumptions which are not applicable to the implementation of organizational innovations. One of its basic assumptions is that during any of the intermediate stages between awareness and use, the individual is free to decide himself whether the innovation shall be tried, and if tried, whether it should be continued. If the innovation does not interest him, he is free to reject it. If he is not pleased with his evaluation

> of it, he can discontinue his use of the innovation. This assumption does not apply to major educational innovations in most school situations, for example, those in which teachers are asked to redefine their roles by their superordinates, or in cases where compensatory programs for lower-class urban schools have been designed by top administrators and teachers must carry them out. Moreover, the adoption of a particular program by administrators does not necessarily mean that it will be instituted or implemented at the school level. (p. 21)

As Gross et al. (1971) emphasized, "while Rogers' model may be useful in understanding the adoption of simple innovations among aggregates of individuals, it appears to be of little value for explaining the implementation of organizational innovations" (p. 22). The logic of this position was not difficult to understand. The system and sub-systems which comprise the individual human being have only one consciousness and only one decision-maker. The system which constitutes a large organization, however, has a multitude of consciousness and many decision-makers. Each of these individual consciousnesses is able to make its own judgment on changes which will affect the organization as a whole and itself in particular. The practical effect of recognition of this difference was to raise serious questions about the usefulness of the diffusion model of change if the change being considered affected a formal organization rather than a collection of individuals.

Fortunately, the body of literature and research concerned with the development of a theory of organization provided helpful insight into the nature of formal organizations. Some of the major points of view expressed by students of organizational theory were included here for background.

Background From Organizational Theory

Theorists have attempted to define the nature of complex organizations for many years. As civilization itself grew larger and more complex, the organizations necessary to coordinate societal activities necessarily grew larger and more complex. The growth of formal organizations meant that relatively more people were in direct and daily contact with organizations of one kind or another than ever before. This phenomenon drew the attention of social scientists, who became interested in the interactions between individuals and the "artificial" environment of the formal organization.

Max Weber, a German social theorist at the turn of the century, was one of the first writers to attempt to analyze the organizational structure which has since become pervasive in the western world--bureaucracy. He was concerned with the origins of authority and saw bureaucracy as the manifestation of a type which he called "rational-legal authority" (p. 57). Weber's concept of rational-legal authority was based on the idea of a body of generalized rules which applied impartially to all individuals who held specifically legitimized status under the rules (Parsons, 1947), pp. 57-58). Specifically,

> Where rational-legal authority involves an organized administrative staff, according to Weber it takes the form of a "bureaucratic" structure. Here each member of the staff occupies an office with a sharp delimitation of powers and a sharp segregation of the sphere of office from his private affairs . . . . The different offices are organized in terms of a stringent hierarchy of higher and lower levels of authority in such a way that each lower level is subject to control and supervision by the one immediately above it. This control and supervision above all includes the power of appointment, promotion, demotion, and dismissal over the incumbents of lower offices . . . . Bureaucracy in this sense, Weber says, is by far the most efficient instrument of large-scale administration which has even been developed and the modern social order in many different spheres has become overwhelmingly dependent upon it. (p. 58)

Weber was emphatic in his belief that the official person be entirely separated from the private person. Otherwise, he believed, the legal-rational system would break back down into the undesirable traditional pattern in which the office-holder's family or connections were more important to retaining his position than was skill or knowledge (Weber, 1911/1947, pp. 329-331). While this conceptual dichotomy was necessary for Weber's purposes, it appeared to lead to the unfortunate belief that positions within an organization could be treated as if there were no human occupant of that position.

Frederick W. Taylor (1911/1942), for example, offered principles of scientific management as a means of securing "the maximum prosperity for the employer coupled with the maximum prosperity for each employee" (p. 9). However, he believed that what each worker wanted most was high wages and that "in the case of any single individual the greatest prosperity can exist only when that individual has reached his highest state of efficiency" (pp. 10-11). Taylor's principles of scientific management reflect this simplistic view--time-study, piece-rate wages, management determination of methods of work. While he made a valuable contribution by demonstrating that many jobs could be done more efficiently, he ignored the motivational, interpersonal, and emotional factors which influence the human beings who held the jobs.

Another early student of organization and management, Henri Fayol (1916/1949), applied scientific methods of analysis to the work of the upper echelon positions in hierarchical organizations. Like Taylor, Fayol developed a list of principles, his having to do with management rather than production. Some of the more familiar of these were division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, subordination of individual interests to the general interest, centralization, and scalar chain (pp. 19-20). Strict adherence to these principles, however, tended to increase managerial efficiency without regard for human values.

Concern for efficiency and the scientific method of studying organizations and their administration expressed by Taylor, Fayol and others were well received in the early 20th Century and in fact were applied to educational institutions by such early authorities as Cubberly, Strayer, and Reeder. Application of the scientific method, however, tended to focus on the organization's requirements to the neglect of interpersonal and human elements. It was not surprising that there was an inevitable reaction to this one-sided viewpoint.

One of the first and most respected of the human relations persuasion of management theorists was Mary Parker Follett (1940). She strongly believed that

> Authority, sovereignty, power, and the basic concepts of government are, in the final analysis, psychological issues. . . . it is clear that government--the direction of the many by the few in the interest of common order and unified action--must, in the long run, rest on consent. (p. 14)

Follett did not argue that job analysis to increase efficiency was worthless or bad; she did, however, argue strongly that nearly everyone had some managerial ability and that the task of job analysis should include not only managers but workers as well. Giving the worker a voice in the process of restructuring his job would "increase the workman's self-respect and pride in his work, which is so necessary for the best results" (p. 86).

The Hawthorne studies conducted in the 1920's provided empirical support for the human relations point of view. Taylor's belief that wages and physical working conditions were the chief motivators for workers was widely accepted at the time. The Hawthorne studies, however, made it clear that something else was acting as a motivator. Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), reporting on the Hawthorne studies, concluded as follows:

> It became clear to the investigators that the limits of human collaboration are determined far more by the informal than the formal organization of the plant. Collaboration is not wholly a matter of logical organization. It presupposes social codes, conventions, traditions, and routine or customary ways of responding to situations. Without such basic codes or conventions, effective work relations are not possible. (p. 568)

The human relations point of view became an extremely popular one with management theorists. It may have been for this reason that the "free individual" model of change was so widely accepted as applicable to organizational settings. Yet it appeared that this model ignored important organizational factors which could be expected to have an influence on the actual implementation of change. For this study, a transition of some sort was needed to provide a connection between the authorities who believed that initiating change depended primarily on individual and collective acceptance of the change and the more recent authorities on organizational change who realized that organizational modifications must be made in order to provide a hospitable environment for implementation of change. The concept of an organization as a two-dimensional entity provided that transition.

Two-dimensional Behavior in Organizations

One of the first authors to speculate systematically on the needs of both the organization and the individual was Chester Barnard (1938). Barnard clearly understood and emphasized the functional dichotomy of organizational goals and individual goals. He viewed organizations as cooperative systems which rely on effectiveness and efficiency for survival.

> Effectiveness relates to the accomplishment of the cooperative purpose, which is social and non-personal in character. Efficiency relates to the satisfaction of individual motives and is personal in character. The test of effectiveness is the accomplishment of a common purpose . . . the test of efficiency is the eliciting of sufficient individual wills to cooperate. (p. 60)

In 1957, Getzels and Guba published their now-familiar model which illustrated the interrelationships between the nomothetic, or organizational, and idiographic, or personal, dimensions of behavior in an organization. Their conceptual description of the model was:

> We conceive of the social system as involving two major classes of phenomena, which are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. There are, first, the _institutions_ with certain roles and _expectations_ that will fulfill

> the goals of the system. Second, inhabiting the system there are the individuals with certain personalities and need-dispositions, whose interactions comprise what we generally call "social behavior." (p. 424)

Getzels and Guba (1957) borrowed the term "effective" and "efficient" to describe behavior that advanced organizational goals in the first instance or personal goals in the second instance (pp. 433-434). They, like Barnard, believed that in order for an organization to exhibit productivity, there must be congruence between its nomothetic and its idiographic dimensions and that to attain congruence there must be a satisfactory compromise between effectiveness, as measured by adherence to organizational role expectations, and efficiency, as measured by satisfaction of personal needs (pp. 433-435).

Other books and articles published during the 1950's reaffirmed the two-dimensional nature of organizations. (See Bakke, 1952; Argyris, 1957; Bakke & Argyris, 1954). However, in spite of the recognition of both the idiographic and nomothetic needs within organizations, the individualistic bias inherent in early innovation research was still commonly accepted by those searching for strategies to promote change within organizations, both educational and non-educational.

Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1950) in their book on curriculum development relied on Kurt Lewin's (1947) description of the necessary components of change: "A successful change includes . . . three aspects: unfreezing (if necessary) the present level, moving to the new level, and freezing group life on the new level" (p. 344). Or, as Smith et al, expanded the unfreezing, moving, and refreezing idea, "changes [must] be induced in the prevailing constellation of forces, these changes [must] be controlled and directed, and a new constellation of forces [must] be established and maintained at the level where the new equilibrium is desired" (p. 638).

They further suggested that in order to modify an existing equilibrium, there were two basic approaches: "(1) by removing or reducing the strength of restraining forces; and (2) by adding to or strengthening the driving forces" (p. 639). The theory is readily applied to the nomothetic, as well as idiographic dimensions of an organization. Yet, when they turned the more theoretical discussion of strategy to tactics, they recommended a guide to the study of curriculum prepared by the Illinois State Department of Public Instruction (cited in Smith et al., 1950) which strongly emphasized psychological levers-activities designed to favorably mold faculty attitudes regarding the proposed change.

E.F. Huse (1975) analyzed sources of resistance to change. Those he identified were:

> 1. To the individuals involved, change, as such is not threatening if they perceive it as helpful.

> 2. Any change will be opposed by the supervisor as a (real or imaginary) threat to his prestige and authority unless he has specifically requested the change.
>
> 3. Any change will usually be opposed by the affected employee unless he has specifically requested the change.
>
> 4. Any change will usually be opposed by the affected group unless the members have specifically requested the change.
>
> 5. The magnitude of the opposition to change (by individual, group or supervisor) will be a direct reflection of the magnitude of the change. (pp. 110-111)

Here too the obvious emphasis in the discussion of resistors to change was the personal dimension, even though the emphasis throughout the book was organizational change.

Much of the seminal research and theory on change in organizations was done in the private sector of business and industry. The personal, attitudinal bias clearly can be seen there also. Paul Lawrence (1954), for example, in an article which discussed methods for dealing with resistance to change, stressed the steps management could take to deal constructively with staff attitudes which are negative to change.

One of the more prolific private-sector authorities on organizational change, L. E. Greiner (1967), reported on a planned organization-wide change in a company identified as Sigma. Greiner stressed the importance of an outside change agent to intervene, mediate, and serve as a communications link (p. 77). The change agent was perceived as valuable for two major reasons, one of organizational importance and one of individual importance. The organization value was derived from the fresh perspective he brought to the problems which had created the need for change in the first place; the individual, or personal, dimension value was in his position as a neutral outside observer who was therefore not as suspect as Sigma management (p. 76).

While Greiner's study of organizational change at Sigma emphasized the idiographic dimension, he recognized the limitations created by that emphasis.

> Clearly, the traditional human relations focus on here-and-now variables within small work groups at lower levels in organizations must give way to a new and broader focus that encompasses not only the time dimension but also the entire organizational system and its environment. (p. 80)

It seemed apparent that the reaction of human relations advocates to the mechanistic approaches of the "scientific management" point of view tended to obscure the very real importance of the organization when change is attempted within its framework. And even in more recent organizational studies which recognized the limitations placed on individual preferences by the organization, the bias toward changing the attitudes of individuals rather than changing organizational barriers was emphasized.

Daniel Katz (1966) analyzed the problem nicely:

> The discovery of the importance of binding-in or socio-emotional functions led some writers to neglect the bureaucratic structure in its contributions to organizational products or outcomes . . . . The human relations approach, in the hands of some students and practitioners, has also overlooked the significance of organizational structures concerned with the efficient attainment of organizational objectives . . . . Similarly, the group dynamics approach with its emphasis upon small group democracy neglects the organizational structure within which the small groups operate--the organizational structure developed to bind together many substructures for the coordination of many people toward a common effort. (p. 171)

He further pointed out that the emotionally satisfying solutions are not necessarily solutions at all.

> In other words, to recognize the necessity for dealing with the socio-emotional functions in organizations does not solve the problem of how such functions relate to the more traditional and still vital task functions of the organization. To neglect the traditional bureaucratic structure is no solution. Another related solution is to recognize the nature of existing organizational structure and to abolish it not by closing one's eyes to its existence but by doing so in fact. Since men are moral and social institutions are immoral, let us do away with social institutions. (pp. 171-172)

The practical approach to initiating curriculum change in an educational organization appeared to involve identification of an organizational function which has major impact on the organization's reaction to change attempts but which remains subject to manipulation by individuals. The decision-making function satisfied both criteria.

The Decision-Making Function in Organizations

The central position of decision making among organizational functions was not difficult to document. Simon (1947) declared decision making to be the heart of the administration of any enterprise; McCamy (1947) suggested that "the reading of a decision is the core of administration, all other attributes of the administrative process being dependent on, interwoven with, and existent for the making of decisions" (p. 41). More than two decades later, decision making was still considered the central organizational activity. "If one premises that 'administrative processes are decisional processes' (and to be sure they are, whatever else they may be), one can of course take decision making as the lens through which all else is viewed (Waldo, 1969, p. 12).

A generally agreed upon definition of decision making was likewise not difficult to come by. Drucker (1969) and Griffiths (1969) both referred to a decision as a kind of judgment. Drucker suggested that reaching a decision involved a judgment about alternatives. "It is rarely a choice between right and wrong. It is at best a choice between 'almost right' and 'possibly wrong'--much more often a choice between two courses of action neither of which is provable more nearly right than the others" (p. 143). Griffiths simply called a decision "a judgment that affects a course of action" (p. 73).

However, while decision making was easily defined and its central role among functions or organizations agreed upon, the actual process of decision making, and the philosophical underpinnings which affect the processes, have been the subject of countless books and articles over the last half century. Since an understanding of expert opinion about the processes involved in decision making was important to the central thesis of the research, a brief discussion of major lines of thought follows.

Decision Making as a Process

If, as has been suggested, decision making can be assumed to be the "core" or "central activity" of an organization, one who wishes to influence that activity in order to initiate change in the organization must understand the processes which lead to decisions as well as discover the power relationships of the individuals involved in the process. A general understanding of the decision-making function in organizations was a necessary prerequisite to this study therefore.

Many authorities analyzed decision making in terms of logical steps to be followed by the decision maker, in terms of elements of decision making, in terms of information flow and fact finding, in terms of centralization and decentralization of the organization (Corson, 1975; Flanagan, 1976; Griffiths, 1959; Mellor, 1976). The rationale was sound. The literature on organizational decision making was intended primarily for the manager or administrator, usually top level, who wished to become better at the task of reaching good decisions. But since the focus of this study was the description of existing decision-making structures, a different perspective on the decision-making process was needed. One promising approach to the study of decision-making seemed to be to consider it within the framework of Getzel and Guba's idiographic/nomothetic organizational dimensions.

Organizational Goals vs. Personal Values

Effective decisions are made in the context of goal orientation.

> The first variable [in effective decision making] is knowing what you want to achieve. We sometimes refer to this as objectives, goals, or desired outcomes. To fail to recognize the importance of this variable is to let outside forces dictate how one will behave. (Brubaker & Nelson, 1974, p. 104)

However, goal orientation has both personal and organizational properties. Decision-making behavior is no different in that respect than the more general organizational behavior described by Getzels and Guba. It is, in fact, a subset of generalized organization behavior.

Richman and Farmer (1974) correctly insisted that "the first question to ask when beginning an analysis of any complex organization and its management is: What is the organization trying to achieve?" (p. 90). But Brubaker and Nelson (1974) emphasized, equally correctly, that "every decision-maker has his own value hierarchy" (p. 100) which they suggest ranges from extremes of "I will sacrifice my life and/or the lives of my family and/or those I dearly love" to "It doesn't make any difference as past experience indicates. My choice, therefore, is between tweedledee and tweedledum" (p. 102).

Peter Drucker (1974) expressed much the same idea in one of his discussions of effective decision making.

> Most books on decision making tell the reader: "First find the facts." But managers who make effective decisions know that one does not start with facts. One starts with opinions . . . . To get the facts first is impossible. There are no facts unless one has a criterion of relevance . . . . The effective decision maker knows that he starts out with opinions anyhow. The only choice he has is between using opinions as a productive factor in the decision-making process and deceiving himself into false objectivity . . . . People inevitably start out with an opinion; to ask them to search for the facts first is even undesirable. They will simply do what everyone is far too prone to do anyhow: look for the facts that fit the conclusion they have already reached. (pp. 470-471)

It was therefore possible to conclude that every organization decision involves a complex mixture of consideration of organizational goals and consideration of personal goals and values. Only after an opinion has been formed by evaluating the decision in the goals/values context can the decision maker establish a "criterion of relevance" for using or discarding the facts to be considered.

Drucker defended this description of the initial phases of decision making by likening it to the scientific method of inquiry.

> The only rigorous method, the only one that enables us to test an opinion against reality, is based on the clear recognition that opinions come first--and that is the way it should be. Then no one can fail to see that we start out with untested hypotheses--in decision making, as in science, the only starting point. We know what to do with hypotheses. One does not argue them; one tests them . . . . The effective executive, therefore, asks, "What do we have to know to test the validity of this hypothesis? What would the facts have to be to make this opinion tenable?" (pp. 471-472)

Where does Drucker's "effective executive" obtain the facts to support his decision? Corson (1960) observed that in colleges and universities especially, "the right to participate in the making of decisions is diffused among a greater proportion of the participants in the enterprise than is typical of other forms of organization" (p. 142), which makes decision making "a process in which the ideas, analyses, and factual contributions of many individuals may be assembled for final approval or decision by an executive" (p. 11).

Input from all levels of an educational organization is widely accepted as a proper part of the decision-making process. However, as Drucker has suggested, the facts presented by different persons will have been subjected to screening by personal value systems, by opinions about the decision to be made.

The decision to commit institutional resources to a new program of studies, for example, might pass easily the test of goal compatibility. However, several persons, all with different positions on Brubaker's and Nelson's value hierarchy relative to this decision, will usually be responsible for information input. The "facts" presented for consideration may tend to vary considerably depending on each individual's perspective. One faculty member may see the proposed change as a personal threat; his "facts" may emphasize the disturbing effects of such a change to the teaching-learning environment. The instructional dean may consider the change to be of long range good to the institution and its clientele; his "facts" will tend to stress benefits to the total institution and the community it serves. The business manager may view the proposed change strictly in terms of the budget and his "facts" will reflect his primary concern with dollars and cents.

J.Q. Wilson (1972) clearly described the psychological effects of the consideration of decisions which would change an organization.

> The proponent of a change is likely to see the benefits of the proposal in personal terms and the costs in organizational terms; everyone else is likely to see the benefits in organizational terms and the costs in personal terms. To the proponent the prospective benefits are . . . direct and easily conceived; the costs are remote, something "the organization will deal with." To organizational members who will be affected by the change the costs to them are likely to be directly and immediately felt; the benefits are something that will accrue remotely to "the organization." (p. 255)

Curriculum Decision vs. Funding Decision

Wilson referred to costs and benefits in psychological terms, but another pertinent factor in organizational decision making has to do with the quite concrete matter of financing any change produced by a decision. It is nearly always true that changes involving the curriculum require funds for implementation. Consequently, the two-dimensional perspective related to individual decision-making behavior in an organizational context was extended to include the inevitable dichotomy connected with the decision itself. Reaching a decision about a change in the curriculum initially involves consideration of the substantitve merits of the proposal; it eventually involves assessment of the resources available for implementation.

Eichholz and Rogers (1964) stated it flatly: "Innovativeness varies directly with financial resources." Within an institution, however, the likelihood of decisions favorable to change rest not only on the total amount of resources available, but more importantly from an operational standpoint, upon the decision to allocate part of the total to fund the desired change.

Several major studies of the organizational aspects of educational institutions supported that conclusion. Corson (1975) referred to allocation of resources as "the heart of the effective management and the effective operation of any enterprise" (p. 158). Blau (1973), in his study of colleges and universities, concurred: "In academic institutions no less than in other organizations, the most important decisions concern the allocation of economic resources. All significant changes require the commitment of financial resources, and the allocation of economic resources determines the structure of the university and the academic work being carried out in it" (p. 278).

Clark (1968) emphasized the crucial nature of internal allocation decisions.

> The extent of financial support is basic in restricting the ability of an institution to innovate. Generally, the more extensive the financial support, the greater the institutional innovativeness. But this is a simplification. More important is the amount of support available specifically for innovations, or at least not committed in advance to particular budget items. P. 16)

Hefferlin (1969) placed the importance of resource allocation decisions in a curriculum context.

> In short, the first key to academic reform is that of resources, an existing program will continue to exist as long as it can find support. A new program will be tolerated if it costs no money or it brings its own support. It will be resisted if the new funds it requires could be used for the expansion of existing programs. And it will be actively opposed and accepted only under duress if existing resources must be divided to include it. (p. 39)

It was thus apparent that two related but separate decisions must be made before a curriculum change can be implemented--a decision based on the academic merits of the proposed change and another decision based on the financial ability of the institution to support the proposal. The next question then was: Who makes those decisions? And, more to the point, does the same person or group make both decisions, either officially or effectively?

Faculty Decision Making Sphere vs. Administrative Decision Making Sphere

In a for-profit kind of business, the decision as to the merits of a new marketing technique *and* the decision to commit organizational resources to it would likely be the official responsibility of a single officer, probably a department or division executive. Input would be contributed by members at various levels subordinate to the manager; as a matter of fact, the development of the idea itself would likely be originated at a subordinate level. But all organizational members would recognize the authority of the manager to make a final decision both as to the worth of the project and as to the amount of resources which would be committed to its implementation.

> In the prototype of a formal organization, the line officers discharge the major functions of the organizations, and the professional staff, auxiliary functions. Accordingly, a factory may hire experts to do market research or public relations, but the main business of the organization--production--remains in the hands of line officals. (Blau & Cott, 1962, p. 173)

The argument for placing authority in the hands of one person to make organizations about both goal activities and allocation of necessary funds to support those activities seems rationally sound. Yet, academic organizations are unlike profit making organizations in at least one critical way, as Blau and Scott noted:

> But in a university, the professional staff discharges the major institutional functions--teaching and research--while the "line" administrators look after the auxiliary functions, such as arranging schedules, housing students, and collecting fees. (p. 173)

Etzioni (1964), in Modern Organization, gave considerable attention to this difference between professional organizations and profit making organizations. He pointed out that in profit making organizations, administrators have the line authority because they are responsible for the major goal activities. Professionals in such organizations deal with secondary activities; therefore, it is functional for them to have limited authority and to be subordinate to administrators.

In professional organizations, the staff-line positions are reversed to a great degree. Professionals in these organizations carry out the major goal activities while administrators carry out support functions and provide the means for the major goal activities (p. 81).

Thus, while a standard organizational chart would display faculty at the bottom of the pyramid, it is apparent that such a perspective is misleading. Highly trained professors cannot be compared to assembly-line workers in terms of their roles in the organization. It is by the efforts of the faculty that the goals of the educational institution are established as well as attained. And, in fact, theory and research have indicated that in educational and service institutions, professional expertise is recognized in the decision-making processes. The educational process, which represents the major goals of a college or university, are clearly the prime concern of the faculty (Baldridge, 1971, pp. 183-188). Corson (1975) pointed out that individual faculty members determine the content of individual courses; major areas and the variety of courses offered are determined by department faculty; and degree requirements as well as regulations concerning student attendance and conduct are the province of college and/or institutional faculties (p. 98). In his study of academic institutions, Blau (1973) found that academics insist on "exclusive authority over their own work"; that "university administrations rarely if ever tell faculty members what topics to cover in their classes or how to conduct experiments" (p. 159).

However, in the crucial matter of resource allocation, the traditional hierarchical pattern of authority appears to apply to a similar degree in educational organizations as in profit-making organizations. Financial policies as well as fund allocations tend to be centralized activities. Blau (1973) discovered that:

> In more than half of the 114 institutions sampled in which faculty members were interviewed, 88 per cent of the respondents checked that the trustees exert substantial influence over financial policies, 99 per cent checked that the administration does, while only 7 per cent attributed influence over financial affairs to the senior and none to junior faculty. (p. 160)

Corson's (1975) study indicated a trend toward even greater centralization of financial decision making to the detriment of faculty participation.

> Their intellectual interests have been circumscribed to the extent that state authorities have specified educational roles for individual institutions and have claimed authority over the introduction of new programs and in some instances courses. (p. 12)

The trend toward "earmarked" appropriations from state and federal funding sources tends to restrict severely the options of local decision-makers by severely restricting the total amount of funds over which they have control. As Corson (1975) observed:

> In public institutions the sums needed to meet faculty salaries and other instructional costs . . . are provided largely by state appropriations. The amounts are determined in an increasing proportion of all states by formulas. . . . Such formulas do not control the selection, promotion, assignment, or tenure of individual faculty members. . . . But they [do] establish relatively rigid frameworks. (pp. 176-177)

An anonymous department chairman quoted by Hefferlin (1969) summarized the effective relationship between administration and faculty in decision making. "As long as finances aren't involved, the department has the most influence, but anything at all that involves finances, the administration steps in and they are the most influential" (p. 90).

Who makes the decisions? The faculty apparently decides the merits of a proposed curriculum change in most colleges and universities. If the new course or program requires no new funds or reallocation of existing resources, the authority to implement also appears to be a faculy prerogative. However, when funds to publicize a new course, or to buy faculty time to teach it, or to provide facilities in which to teach it are required, that decision is usually made at an administrative level, making the administrator effectively responsible for both the curriculum and the financial decisions.

Normative vs. Bureaucratic Governance Structures

While administrative veto-power over curriculum matters may be deplored by many, it was not difficult to determine how such a state of affairs developed. Growth appears to be the major factor. Corson (1975) indicated that early colleges were informally governed.

> Traditionally, the college was held together as an organization by normative values: the individuals who made it up, and particularly the faculty and, less cognitively and more emotionally, the students, "shared beliefs, attitudes and values." (pp. 86-87)

As growth occurred, however, he observed that individual changes in patterns of governance also occurred:

> As we have moved over the past five decades in this country from the small college . . . to the multiversity . . . , the normative basis for governance has slowly but implacably been replaced by increasing emphasis on hierarchical structure, on refined processes of superordination-subordination, and on rules and procedures . . . .
>
> The larger the academic enterprise, the more difficult it is to maintain a set of beliefs that will claim the interest and zeal of the faculties and students of several schools and many departments . . . . On most campuses common beliefs are found only in the department . . . . (p. 87)

Since large size appears to subvert the possibility for normative governance, modern institutions have developed structures to provide a different sort of governance. "Modern civilization depends largely on organizations as the most rational and efficient form of social grouping known. By coordinating a large number of human actions, the organization creates a powerful social tool" (Etzioni, 1964, p. 1)

Blau (1973) too contended that

> For hundreds or thousands of people to be engaged in a common enterprise . . . explicit procedures are needed for organizing and coordinating their activities, which is not necessary in small groups. Universities and colleges, like other organizations, therefore develop administrative machineries to organize and coordinate the academic work of students and faculty. (p. 1)

While the necessity for administrative authority in large organizations is generally agreed upon by those who have studied them, the danger it poses to academic goals in educational institutions also has been recognized.

> Large academic institutions, no less than other large organizations, require and acquire a complex administrative apparatus, and administrative concerns with budgets and regular procedures can easily endanger academic pursuits. (Blau, 1973, p. 7)

The combination of two factors, growth, which creates a need for administrative mechanisms, and the shifting of financing for colleges from private sources (tuition, private donations) to public or governmental sources (state funding of operations and capital outlay, state and federal grants largely earmarked) for decreasing faculty authority to decide how institutional funds will be spent. Growth in size and the increasing importance of public sources of financing are broad societal trends which probably cannot be influenced directly by faculties. There is, however, a third factor, uniformly mentioned by the authors of major studies, which appeared to be more susceptible to manipulation at a local level.

Faculty vs. Administrator Orientation to the Organization

Faculty members have, to varying degrees, a different orientation to the organization than do administrators. Corson (1975) observed that "the bulk of all professors are more concerned with substantive issues of the discipline in which they have been trained, with the concerns of the 'guilds' of which they are members, than with the whole curriculum . . . ." (pp. 98-99). Blau and Scott (1962) suggested that the difference in perceptions could be explained in the context of Gouldner's (1957) description of cosmopolitans and locals. They found that while "a professional orientation motivates a person to do better work in terms of professional standards, it also gives him a basis for ignoring administrative considerations . . . ." (Blau and Scott, 1962, p. 246).

Unfortunately, the result of ignoring administrative considerations, according to Millett (1968), can be irresponsible decision making.

> There are two major deficiencies in faculty decision making which affect the degree of 'finality' which may be accorded their proposals for institutional action. One deficiency is the

> possible inadequate attention given to the administrative feasibility of the proposed course of action. Obviously, the availability of financial resources is a continuing restraint upon academic decision making. A college or university can only spend as much as it receives in income, and the pattern of expenditures must ensure preservation of the institution. . . . Unless a faculty is intimately aware of the administrative capabilities and costs involved in every decision, faculty organization making is likely to be administratively and financially irresponsible (pp. 13-14)

Etzioni (1964) analyzed the dilemma in terms of organizational role conflict. He pointed out that the top administrator, and to a lesser degree the rest of the administrators in professional organizations, requires two different and basically incompatible sets of orientation.

> On the one hand, the role should be in the hands of a professional in order to ensure that the commitments of the head will match organizational goals. A professional at the head of the authority structure will mean that professional activity is recognized as the major goal activity, and that the needs of professionals will be more likely to receive understanding attention. On the other hand, organizations have needs that are unrelated to their specific goal activity. Organizations have to obtain funds to finance their activities, recruit personnel to staff the various functions, and allocate the funds and personnel which have been recruited. Organizational heads must know how to keep the system integrated by giving the right amount of attention and funds to the various organizational needs, including secondary needs. A professional may endanger the integration of the professional organization by over-emphasizing the major goal activity and neglecting secondary functions. (p. 82)

The practical result of cosmopolitanism among faculties has been a growing tendency for faculty members to leave administration to the administrators. Corson (1975), in fact, described most colleges and universities as examples of "organization dualism: the simultaneous existence of two separate and relatively little-related organizations--the academic organization governed by the faculty and the business affairs organization governed by administrators and the trustees" (p. 147).

Blau's (1973) study of academic organizations supported the notion that setting policies and making budgetary decisions are the responsibility of administrators. Faculty authority appeared to be confined to instructional and appointment decisions which did not involve financial matters (p. 278).

Blau also suggested a rationale for the existing dichotomy of decision making in academic organizations.

> To use an extreme example, why should a Fermi want to take time out from his vital scientific work to help in distributing the budget at the University of Chicago? The faculty members whose renown gives them most authority are probably the ones most absorbed in their scholarly work and least interested in taking on financial responsibilities. (p. 278)

Etzioni's (1964) earlier study suggested much the same conclusion.

> Most successful professionals are not motivated to become administrators. Some would refuse any administrative role, including the top one of university president or hospital chief, because of their commitment to professional values and ties to professional groups, and because they feel that they would not be capable of performing the administrative role successfully. (p. 83)

Anderson (1968) noted the existence of the dichotomy and he suggested that it causes pervasive conflict.

> Because administrators of formal organizations are increasingly dependent upon highly skilled professionals, one of the most typical characteristics of modern organizations is conflict between authority of position and authority generated by professional competence and expertise. (p. 8)

The organizational circumstances surrounding curriculum change efforts in academic organizations can, without fear of exaggeration, be described as complex. For the faculty member, who by recent tradition has had little to do with administrative affairs in his institution, the complexity is compounded by a lack of power to affect decisions about money. And, as has been previously shown, resource allocation decisions are in fact educational policy decisions. Given the undisputed expertise of faculty in their own areas of specialization in combination with the veto power of administrators with regard to curriculum matters, it is little wonder that a certain amount of conflict between faculty and administration is generated.

The question is, how can faculty initiative for curriculum change most effectively be introduced into the decision-making structure of the organization? What tactics are apt to be more successful than others? Since "decisions are often negotiated compromises among competing groups" (Richman and Farmer, 1974, p. 30), it follows that tactics should be available to enable persons with little or no official decision-making power to influence a particular decision.

The Formal vs. the Informal Organization

A faculty member with no official administrative status has no formal entry point into the critical resource allocation part of the decision-making process involved in curriculum change. And, as Hefferlin (1969) phrased the obvious, "not only must the necessary resources be available for reform, but an advocate must succeed in gaining access to them" (p. 44).

How to gain access? The answer lies to some extent in yet another two dimensional aspect of organizations--the existence of both a formal organizational power structure and an informal influence network. Blau and Scott (1962) asserted that

> It is impossible to understand the nature of a formal organization without investigating the networks of informal relations and the unofficial norms as well as the formal hierarchy of authority and the official body of rules, since the formally instituted and the informally emerging patterns are inextricably intertwined. (p. 6)

The organization chart can depict the locus of authority and responsibility in an organization. It can also describe the locus of formal decision-making power, but as Bennis (1966) declared: "The formal organizational chart only rarely, if ever, resembles the power structure" (p. 185). The true power structure is more likely a composite of the formal hierarchy, an influence structure that stems from personal qualities (for example, professional expertise, knowledge, charisma) of both administrators and faculty, and informal power which tends to grow out of the willingness to use the ability to influence decision making.

> For example, a professor can exert considerable informal power with regard to some decisions . . . because he or she has or is perceived to have the ability either to use or to determine that others use coercion, penalties, rewards, and the like. (Richman and Farmer, 1974, p. 158)

Baldridge's (1971) study of New York University tended to confirm the contention that power can be obtained through informal means. In his political model of organizations, which he argued is a more accurate description of reality than either the bureaucratic or collegial models, the organization is viewed as a coalition of competing groups with conflicting ideas about what is best for the organization. In such a context, decision making may be accomplished in an atmosphere of applied power rather than administrative mandate.

Even in organizations in which politicized groups do not appear to be strong, the potential to influence of loosely defined groups which are not a part of the formal administrative apparatus should not be discounted. Bridges (1970), for example, speculated that while the preponderance of the literature treats the decision maker as the "_origin_ for his own decisions . . . and an _origin_ for the behavior of subordinates" (p. 7), there is no reason to believe that in fact the administrator's decisions can be guided, formed, and even controlled by subordinates. He categorized this "pawn-like behavior" into three types:

> 1. Administrative man--_pawn without his knowledge_. In making his decisions, the administrator clearly is not acting on his own, but he feels that he is an origin. He is unaware that his behavior matches the intent of his subordinates and is caused by their purposes, desires, and aims.
> 2. Administrative man--_pawn against his will_. In making his decision, the administrator is most certainly not acting on his own and is aware that the goals underlying his behavior are primarily those of his subordinates and not his own.
> 3. Administrative man--_pawn by choice_. In making his decision, the administrator, willingly and knowingly, uses the goals of his subordinates as the principal basis for choosing the course of action he will take. (p. 12)

Iannacconne (1964) also theorized that one source of power separate from the formal authority structure is the informal organization, which he demonstrated can provide a vehicle for influencing decision making by modifying the behavior of those who do occupy authority positions (p. 229-230).

Thus it would appear that faculty access to the decision-making process can be obtained through the informal structure. For example, Richman and Farmer (1974) observed that leadership is a key to possessing power and that administrators, especially in academic institutions, are not the exclusive holders of leadership qualities.

> Because leadership stems from personal and situational factors, and not only or necessarily from formal authority, informal leaders of various types emerge in all kinds of organizations. This is especially true within the faculties of academic institutions where expertise of many types is pervasive. And interested faculty members frequently find that there are many power vacuums that can be filled and various kinds of actions and decision that they can initiate (p. 158)

Why then, in light of an abundance of research and theory pointing to the effectiveness of informal mechanisms for gaining power, do many faculty continue to feel impotent, unable to effectively implement as simple a change as initiating a new course? The major underlying assumption of this study was that lack of knowledge about the decision-making process in general and the participants involved, both official and unofficial, in particular was a primary factor. The literature reviewed heretofore tended to support this assumption.

A second underlying assumption was that the lack of knowledge about how decisions are made in individual institutions might be due, at least in part, to inaccurate perceptions about who was involved, and to what extent, in various kinds of curriculum change decisions. A brief discussion of social perception, especially as it relates to organizational behavior provided a rationale for the assumption.

Social Perception and Understanding Decision Making

The concept of perception includes the ability to understand what the senses receive. Social psychologists, departing somewhat from the stimulus-bound study of perception, have investigated the connection between social processes and perception. Since perception includes the notion of understanding, the interplay of stimuli in social groups, as contrasted with the rigorous one-stimulus-at-a-time approach most commonly used to study perception, would appear to be a critical factor in determining how perceptions are influenced within and by the social context.

Social psychologists generally agree upon three major aspects of social influence on perception. Bartley (1969) described them as follows:

> First is the influence brought about rather directly by other people. It may be operative through the presence,

> examples, wishes, or prestige or other people even though these other people are not present . . . . Possibly in this same category, or at least in one analogous to it, are the perceptual responses that are what they are by reason of specific personal need. They represent the subject's value system . . . The second aspect of social influence is one in which socially meaningful and socially originated properties are responded to. As an example, there is the immediate response that is guided by a social concept of ideal. The perceptual properties of situations are socially describable and evolve only in a social context . . . . A third aspect is the phenomenon of individual differences. Some such differences in organisms are basically anatomical and are not acquired by reason of a social context, but others evolve out of the interaction between organisms. Some human perception is what it is because of this sort of interaction. (pp. 421-422)

Perceptual differences among individuals in social groupings, then, are to be expected. In addition, those differences appear to be influenced by other people, by social structures and by individual differences which are partially the result of interaction between organisms.

Since organizations are a type of social grouping, it followed that the social influence of the organization and persons in the organization would affect perceptions of individual organizational members in ways that could be attributed in varying degrees to the three aspects of social influence described by Bartley (1969).

March and Simon (1965) placed the problem of differing individual perceptions in the context of organizational conflict and communication patterns. They indicated that conflict in an organization has two basic sources--goal conflict and conflict caused by individual differences in perceptions of reality. The major factors affecting differentiation of individual perceptions according to March and Simon, are "differences in individual goals and values, the number of independent information sources, and the extent to which information is channeled" (p. 127-128).

The communications structure appeared to the context in which most organizational authorities placed problems connected with differences in perception. Drucker (1974) equated communication with perception--"Communication is perception" (p. 483). In fact, he asserted that the person who emits the communication merely utters; it is the recipient who communicates.

> Perception, we know, is not logic. It is experience. This means, in the first place, that one always perceives a configuration. One cannot perceive single specifics. They are always part of a total picture. The "silent language," that is, the gestures, the tone of voice, the environment altogether, not to mention the cultural and social referents, cannot be dissociated from the spoken language. In fact, without them the spoken word has no meaning and cannot communicate. (p. 483)

Mary Parker Follett (1940) implicitly discussed the concept of perceptions when she suggested that a disagreement is likely not to be about anything ostensible. What

A sees vividly, B cannot comprehend at all. Therefore, what A argues has no relevance to B and vice versa. Both are likely to see reality, but each is seeing a different aspect of it. In other words, the conflict is a result of incongruity of perceptions (p. 142).

In addition to its potential for creating conflict, misperception can cause serious information problems. One of the areas Hefferlin (1969) investigated was the perceptions of administrators, department chairmen, and faculty as to the source of initiative for program changes in the respondents' institutions. The results indicated that each group saw itself as the initiator of change more frequently than did either of the other groups (p. 75). Hefferlin concluded:

> Not only do administrators and faculty members have mirror images of themselves as the instigators of reform, but their high evaluation of themselves tends to affect their opinions of each other--generally for the worse. (p. 77)

Perceptual data such as were used in this study can provide limited information about the reality of decision making in the various institutions. The study can, however, illustrate differences in perceptions which may contribute to conflict in the organization and frustration in the individual. From a practical standpoint, it can provide the faculty member who attempts to gain access to the decision-making process an insight into the information gathering and communications strategies which may need to be considered in order to achieve his or her objective.

Summary

Planned change has traditionally and typically been described in individualistic terms. While effective change must involve individual attitudes and decisions, it was argued that change attempts within organizations, in this case educational institutions, are greatly influenced by organizational factors.

The specific factor emphasized herein, decision making, was chosen for study because, while it plays a major role in the reaction of organization to change attempts, the processes of decision making remain accessible to interested individuals who do not necessarily occupy a formal position in the process.

In order to gain actual access, however, there must be some clear understanding of the functioning of specific decision-making environments. It was suggested that clear understanding depends on individual perception which is a function greatly influenced by such factors as individual differences, social milieu, and communication skills. Because of the subjective nature of perception, it was further suggested that individuals in different organizational status groups would be very likely to differ in their understandings of decision-making processes.

CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Chapter III is a description of perceptions of the decision-making processes for curriculum change in Florida community colleges. The chapter is comprised of two major categories--perceptions as to final decision maker for nine separate decisions and perceptions about the number of other participants involved in those same nine decisions. In both sections, a statistical analysis of the data is presented with $p \leq .05$ as the accepted level of significance.

Perceptions As To Final Decision Maker

Findings for All Colleges

In hierarchical organizations, one officer is normally held responsible and given authority to make final decisions in specific areas (see pp. 27-29). Conceivably, however, faculty communications within organizations could create differences of opinion as to who exactly is finally responsible for what areas of decision making. To judge the extent of those differences of opinion regarding the holder of final authority to approve or reject nine specific types of curriculum changes, respondents were asked to identify by title the person they believed to have that final decision-making authority. Table 1 shows responses for all study participants.

President as final decision maker

By all respondents. Over all decisions, the president was chosen final decision maker most frequently, 42.1% of the time. The next most frequently selected titles were academic dean with 12.7% and the institutional academic vice president with 8.6%. In all, 63.4% of respondents named either the president, vice president or academic dean as final decision maker, 20.8% indicated they did not know who had the authority for final decisions, and the remaining 25.8% of responses were distributed among the remaining titles. When individual decisions were inspected, in only three instances was any one title named by 50% or more of the respondents as the official with authority to make the final judgment about a decision. The president was named holder of final authority to decide whether funds would be allocated to support a new credit course by 60.7% of the respondents, whether funds should be provided to support a new noncredit course by 50%, and to change graduation requirements by 69.3%.

Due to the collapsed form of the data in Table 1, it is of course, highly probable that some of the differences in designation of final decision represented real differences in designation of authority for final decisions

Table 1. Perceived Final Decision-Maker By Decision

Title[b]	Decision[a]									
	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%
President	72	48.0	91	60.7	32	21.3	66	44.0	54	36.0
Institutional Academic Vice President	17	11.3	15	10.0	14	9.3	11	7.3	10	6.7
Chief Business Officer			2	1.3			4	2.7		
Institutional Curriculum Coordinator										
Institutional Curriculum Committee	25	16.7	6	4.0	16	10.7	4	2.7	11	7.3
Campus Provost	2	1.3	4	2.7	1	.7	5	3.3	6	4.0
Campus Academic Vice President									1	.7
Academic Dean	16	10.7	16	10.7	24	16.0	17	11.3	21	14.0
Campus Curriculum Committee	4	2.7	2	1.3	3	2.0	1	.7	4	2.7
Division Chairman	5	3.3	2	1.3	10	6.7	8	5.3	14	9.3
Department Chairman	4	2.7	2	1.3	22	14.7	3	2.0	9	6.0
Faculty	3	2.0	1	.7	20	13.3	1	.7	6	4.0
Don't Know	2	1.3	9	6.0	8	5.3	30	20.0	14	9.3

Table 1--continued

Title[b]	Decision[a]									
	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	All	%
President	75	50.0	23	15.3	51	3.4	104	69.3	568	42.1
Institutional Academic Vice President	7	4.7	19	12.7	13	8.7	10	6.7	116	8.6
Chief Business Officer	4	2.7			4	2.7			14	1.0
Institutional Curriculum Coordinator			1	.7					1	.1
Institutional Curriculum Committee	5	3.3	4	2.7	3	2.0	11	7.3	85	6.3
Campus Provost	6	4.0	5	3.3	7	4.7			36	2.7
Campus Academic Vice President			1	.7	1	.7			3	.2
Academic Dean	18	12.0	27	18.0	22	14.7	11	7.3	172	12.7
Campus Curriculum Committee			3	2.0			2	1.3	19	1.4
Division Chairman	10	6.7	21	14.0	11	7.3	1	.7	82	6.1
Department Chairman	4	2.7	12	8.0	5	3.3			61	4.5
Faculty	1	.7	11	7.3	2	1.3	2	1.3	47	3.5
Don't Know	20	13.3	23	15.3	31	20.7	9	6.0	146	10.8

Table 1--continued

---

[a] Types of curriculum change decisions

1. Creation of a new credit course
2. Funding a new credit course
3. Changing content of a credit course
4. Funding a change in content of a credit course
5. Creation of a new noncredit course
6. Funding a new noncredit course
7. Changing the delivery system for either a credit or noncredit course
8. Funding a change in the delivery system for a credit or noncredit course
9. Changing graduation requirements

[b] Not all colleges have all titles; all titles were included in order to use the same questionnaire for both single campus and multicampus colleges.

depending upon the college. Therefore, the data were expanded and subcategorized in several ways in order better to identify perceptual differences.

By status groups. The major research interest in the study was investigation of the existence of any perceptual differences among status groups as to the identity of the officer with final authority to make decisions about selected types of curriculum change.

When percentages of selections of final decision makers were compared by status over all decisions, several differences in perceptions stood out (Table 2). Business officers named the president final decision maker 62.3% of the time, nearly twice the percentage of faculty (32.6%) or department chairmen (31.5%) who so designated the president. Central administrators in general tended to identify the president as final decision maker more frequently than faculty of department chairmen, with 51.4% of vice presidents and 57.3% of presidents so indicating.

The difference between proportions of business officers and all respondents in naming the president final decision maker was significant at the .001 level as was the difference between business officers and faculty members (Table 3).

Faculty members and department chairmen tended to name the president final decision maker significantly

Table 2. Final Decision Maker Choices for All Colleges and All Respondents.

Decision Maker*

Status	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%
Faculty	175	32.8	31	5.8	9	1.7	1	.2	35	6.6	9	1.7	0	0
Dept. Ch.	85	31.5	28	10.4	3	1.1	0	0	31	11.5	3	1.1	3	1.1
Bus. Ofcr.	101	62.3	17	10.5	2	1.2	0	0	7	4.3	5	3.1	0	0
Vice Pres.	111	51.4	17	7.9	0	0	0	0	5	2.3	4	1.9	0	0
President	98	57.3	23	13.5	0	0	0	0	7	4.1	15	8.8	0	0
Total	568	42.1	116	8.6	14	1.0	1	.1	85	6.3	36	2.7	3	.2

* 1. President
2. Institutional Academic Vice President
3. Chief Business Officer
4. Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
5. Institutional Curriculum Committee
6. Chief Campus Administrator
7. Campus Academic Vice President
8. Academic Dean
9. Campus Curriculum Committee
10. Division Chairperson
11. Department Chairperson
12. Faculty Peers
13. Don't Know

Table 2--continued

Decision Maker*

Status	8	%	9	%	10	%	11	%	12	%	13	%	N	1,2,8
Faculty	66	12.4	6	1.1	30	5.6	30	5.6	35	6.6	106	20.0	531	50.8
Dept. Ch.	45	16.7	11	4.1	17	6.3	12	4.4	8	3.0	24	8.9	270	58.6
Bus. Ofcr.	7	4.3	0	0	10	6.2	1	.6	2	1.2	10	6.2	162	77.1
Vice Pres.	41	19.0	1	.4	16	7.4	15	7.0	2	.9	4	1.9	216	78.3
President	13	7.6	1	.6	9	5.3	3	1.8	0	0	2	1.2	171	78.4
Total	172	12.7	19	1.4	82	6.1	61	4.5	47	3.5	146	10.8	1350	

Table 3. Perception of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Business Officers and All Respondents

	Response President	All Other Responses	Total
Business Officers	71.68 101	90.32 61	162
All Respondents	597.32 568	752.68 782	1350
Total	669	843	1512

$X^2 = 24.09$ $p < .001$

Perception of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Business Officers and Faculty

	Response President	All Other Responses	Total
Business Officers	64.05 101	97.95 61	162
Faculty	209.95 173	321.05 358	531
Total	274	419	693

$X^2 = 46.01$ $p < .001$

Note: For all contingency tables, the number in the upper left corner is the expected frequency, the number in the lower right corner is the observed frequency.

less frequently than expected, at the .001 level for faculty and at the .01 level for department chairmen (Table 4).

Table 4. Perception of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Faculty and All Respondents

	Response President	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	209.18 173	321.82 358	531
All Respondents	531.82 568	818.18 782	1350
Total	741	1140	1881

$X^2 = 14.39$ $p < .001$

Perception of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Department Chairmen And All Respondents

	Response President	All Other Responses	Total
Department Chairmen	108.83 85	161.17 185	270
All Respondents	544.17 568	805.83 782	1350
Total	653	967	1620

$X^2 = 10.49$ $p < .01$

Number of different final decision makers named

Differences in perception could also be observed in the differences in numbers of final decision makers designated. For all status levels, the three titles most frequently named final decision maker were the president, academic vice president, and academic dean. But while faculty named one of those three titles 50.8%, and chairman 58.6% of the time, 77.1% of business officers, 78.3% of vice presidents, and 78.4% of presidents did so (Table 2). Lack of perceptual consensus about the final decision maker was also observable in the number of different responses for each decision. Consensus would be indicated by little disagreement as to final decision maker, or a small number of different choices. Perceptual variances would appear as disagreement as to final decision maker, or a large number of different choices.

By medians for status groups. Insepction of numbers of different final decision makers named by decision (Table 5) disclosed further status differences. Faculty named a minimum of 7 and a maximum of 10 different final decision makers for a single decision. Responses of department chairmen ranged from a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 10; business officers from 2 to 7; vice presidents from 2 to 7; and presidents 3 to 7. Again, perceptions of central administrators were different from other respondents; notably, central administrators never named more than 7 final decision makers for any decision, while faculty never named less than 7.

Table 5. Number of Different Final Decision-Makers Named by Status And By Decision

	Decision									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Median
Faculty	9	9	8	9	9	8	10	8	7	8.63
Dept. Ch.	6	5	8	7	10	8	9	8	5	7.67
Bus. Ofcr.	5	4	6	5	6	5	5	7	2	5.13
V. Pres.	5	4	7	5	6	5	7	6	2	5.33
Pres.	4	3	7	4	7	5	7	5	3	4.75
Common Median										6.20

To determine significance of differences, if any, the extension of the median test was applied to the data in Table 5.

When all status levels were considered together, a significant difference at the .001 level was found in numbers of decision makers named (Table 6). Faculty and department chairmen were combined in this analysis to avoid the existence of an empty cell. Since faculty and department chairmen medians are more like each other than like any other category, this combination was not considered wasteful of data.

By medians for instructional and funding decision groups. Because of speculation in the literature having to do with differences in decision-making patterns depending on whether the decision concerned curriculum or fund allocation, data were divided into two groups. Decisions 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 were essentially instructional decisions

Table 6. Numbers of Final Decision-Makers Named By Status Extension Of The Median Test

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Faculty and Department Chairmen	8.4 15	9.6 3	18
Business Officers	4.2 1	4.8 8	9
Vice Presidents	4.2 2	4.8 7	9
Presidents	4.2 3	4.8 6	9
Total	21	24	45

$X^2 = 17.10 \quad p < .001$

while decisions 2, 4, 6, and 8 were funding decisions. When analyzed by type of decision (Table 7), the median for instructional decisions was 6.58 and for funding decisions it was 5.36. Difference in medians for the two types of decisions was not found to be significant.

Faculty as final decision maker

Another difference by status had to do with perceptions of faculty as final decision maker (Table 2). While percentages of all status groups designating the faculty as final decision maker were small, the percentage of faculty which did so (6.6%) was from over 2 to 6 times the percentage of other groups. Only 3% of department chairmen, 1.2% of business officers, .9% of vice presidents and no presidents indicated that faculty had final decision making authority.

Table 7. Number of Different Final Decision Makers Named Comparing Instructional and Funding Decisions - Frequency Distributions

Number Named	Instructional		Funding		All	
10	2	25			2	45
9	3	23	2	20	5	43
8	2	20	4	18	6	38
7	6	18	2	14	8	32
6	4	12	1	12	5	24
5	4	8	7	11	11	19
4	1	4	3	4	4	8
3	1	3	1	1	2	4
2	2	2			2	2
1						
0						
Median	6.58		5.36		6.20	

Designation by faculty of faculty as final decision maker compared to faculty designation by all respondents indicated that faculty tended to name faculty significantly more frequently ($p < .01$) than expected (Table 8).

"Don't know final decision maker" responses

Finally, analysis of the "Don't know" responses revealed status differences. Faculty indicated 20% of the time that they did not know who was the final decision maker while only 8.9% of chairmen, 6.2% of business

Table 8. Perceptions Of Faculty As Final Decision Maker Comparing Faculty And All Respondents

	Response		
	President	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	23.15 35	507.85 496	531
All Respondents	58.85 47	1291.15 1303	1350
Total	82	1799	1881

$X^2 = 8.83 \quad p < .01$

officers, 1.9% of vice presidents and 1.2% of presidents admitted to not knowing.

The differences between faculty responses of "Don't know" and all respondents was found to be significant at the .001 level (Table 9).

Table 9. Response of "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Comparing Faculty And All Respondents

	Response		
	Don't Know	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	71.14 106	459.86 425	531
All Respondents	180.86 146	1169.14 1204	1350
Total	252	1629	1881

$X^2 = 27.48 \quad p < .001$

Findings for Colleges Grouped by Size

Because previous research as well as theory gave reason to believe that size may be an important factor in decision making, status differences were analyzed by college size in order to determine whether size-related differences in responses existed. There were four small colleges, (1500 or less FTE) and 12 colleges in each of the medium (1500 to 5000 FTE) and large (over 5000 FTE) groups.

President as final decision maker

By size alone. When totals for all colleges were recast by size (Table 10) it appeared that size itself, as well as status comparisons within each size group, is related to perceptions of the locus of final decision-making authority. All respondents in all colleges named the president final decision maker 42.1% of the time. When perceptions by all respondents of the president as final decision-maker were analyzed by size, however, small college respondents named the president 53.8% of the time; large college respondents, 39.1% of the time. As Table 11 indicates, those differences were significant at the .01 level.

By status groups. Status differences were noted also. While the percentage of faculty for all colleges together naming the president final decision maker was

Table 10. Final Decision Maker By Size

Decision Maker	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	10	%	11	%	12	%	13	%	N	1 2,8
Small Colleges																												
Faculty	55	47.0	1	.8	1	.8	1	.8	6	5.1	0	0	0	0	18	15.4	0	0	5	4.3	18	15.4	4	3.4	8	6.8	117	63.2
Dept. Ch.	26	57.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	31.1	0	0	2	4.4	1	2.2	0	0	2	4.4	45	88.9
Bus. Ofcr.	16	88.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	18	94.5
Vice Pres.,	3	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11.1	0	0	0	0	9	50.0	0	0	1	5.6	2	11.1	0	0	1	5.6	18	61.1
President	14	77.8	2	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	0	0	0	0	18	94.5
Total	114	52.8	3	1.4	1	.5	1	.5	8	3.7	0	0	0	0	43	19.9	0	0	8	3.2	22	10.2	4	1.9	12	5.5	216	
Medium Colleges																												
Faculty	75	33.3	18	8.0	2	.9	0	0	14	6.2	0	0	0	0	39	17.3	1	.4	12	5.3	7	3.1	17	7.6	40	17.8	225	58.6
Dept. Ch.	32	29.6	12	11.1	3	2.8	0	0	8	7.4	0	0	0	0	21	19.4	4	3.7	9	8.3	4	3.7	5	4.6	10	9.3	108	60.1
Bus. Ofcr.	36	64.8	9	16.7	0	0	0	0	7	13.0	0	0	0	0	2	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	0	0	54	85.2
Vice Pres.	47	47.5	10	10.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	24.2	0	0	11	11.1	3	3.0	1	1.0	3	3.0	99	81.8
President	40	55.6	4	5.6	0	0	0	0	5	6.9	2	2.8	0	0	10	13.9	1	1.4	6	8.3	2	2.8	0	0	2	2.8	72	75.1
Total	229	41.0	53	9.5	5	.9	0	0	34	6.1	2	.4	0	0	96	17.2	6	1.1	38	6.8	16	2.9	24	4.3	55	9.9	558	
Large Colleges																												
Faculty	43	22.7	12	6.3	6	3.2	0	0	15	7.9	9	4.8	0	0	9	4.8	5	2.6	13	6.9	5	2.6	14	7.4	58	30.7	189	33.8
Dept. Ch.	27	23.1	16	13.7	0	0	0	0	23	19.7	3	2.6	3	2.6	10	8.5	7	6.0	6	5.1	7	6.0	3	2.6	12	10.3	117	45.3
Bus. Ofcr.	50	55.6	8	8.9	2	2.2	0	0	0	0	5	5.6	0	0	4	4.4	0	0	10	44.4	1	1.1	1	1.1	9	10.0	90	68.9
Vice Pres.	61	61.6	7	7.0	0	0	0	0	3	3.0	4	4.0	0	0	8	8.0	1	1.0	4	4.0	10	10.1	1	1.0	0	0	99	76.6
President	44	54.3	17	21.0	0	0	0	0	2	2.5	13	16.0	0	0	2	2.5	0	0	2	2.5	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	81	77.8
Total	225	39.1	60	10.4	8	1.4	0	0	43	7.5	34	5.9	3	.5	33	5.7	13	2.3	35	6.1	24	4.2	19	3.3	79	13.7	576	

Table 10--continued

*1. President

2. Institutional Academic Vice President

3. Chief Business Officer

4. Institutional Curriculum Coordinator

5. Institutional Curriculum Committee

6. Chief Campus Administrator

7. Campus Academic Vice President

8. Academic Dean

9. Campus Curriculum Committee

10. Division Chairperson

11. Department Chairperson

12. Faculty Peers

13. Don't Know

32.6%, 47.0% of faculty in small colleges, 33.3% in medium, and only 22.7% in large colleges designated the president, differences significant at the .001 level as indicated in Table 12.

Table 11. Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker By Size

	Response		
	President	All Other Responses	Total
Small	90.88 114	125.12 102	216
Medium	237.44 229	323.23 329	558
Large	242.35 225	333.65 351	576
Total	568	782	1350

$X^2 = 12.54 \quad p < .01$

Table 12. Perceptions of President As Final Decision Maker By Size And By Status

	Response		
	President	All Other Responses	Total
Small	38.12 55	78.88 62	117
Medium	73.31 75	151.69 150	225
Large	61.58 43	127.42 146	189
Total	173	358	531

$X^2 = 19.46 \quad p < .001$

Generally, all status levels in small colleges chose the president as final decision maker more frequently than when all colleges were taken together, and in large colleges, all status levels chose the president less frequently, with medium size colleges hovering near the percentages for all colleges together. The major exceptions were vice presidents in small colleges who selected the president only 16.7% of the time, somewhat more than all vice presidents.

Differences by size were found to be significant for department chairmen ($p < .001$), business officers ($p < .05$), and vice presidents ($p < .01$), as shown in Table 13. Among presidents, no difference based on size was noted.

Number of different final decision makers named

The range of choices of final decision maker showed some differences by size also. While in all colleges together, the choice of either president, vice president, or academic dean totaled from 50.8% (faculty) to 78.4% (presidents), in small colleges one of those three titles was chosen from 61.1% (vice presidents) of the time to 94.5% (presidents and business officers) of the time. Again, in medium sized colleges, all status levels tended to choose the president, vice president or academic dean in proportions similar to the percentages for all colleges together, but in large colleges status groups uniformly

Table 13. Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker By Size And By Status

	Department Chairmen Response		Total
	President	All Other Responses	
Small	14.17 26	30.83 19	45
Medium	34.0 32	74.0 76	108
Large	36.83 27	80.17 90	117
Total	85	185	270

$X^2 = 18.42 \quad p < .001$

	Business Officers Response		
	President	All Other Responses	Total
Small	11.22 16	6.78 2	18
Medium	33.67 35	20.33 19	54
Large	56.11 50	33.89 40	90
Total	101	61	162

$X^2 = 7.31 \quad p < .05$

	Vice Presidents Response		
	President	All Other Responses	Total
Small	9.25 3	8.75 15	18
Medium	50.87 47	48.13 52	99
Large	50.87 61	48.13 38	99
Total	111	105	216

$X^2 = 13.44 \quad p < .01$

Table 13--continued

	Presidents Response President		All Other Responses		Total
	10.32		7.68		
Small		14		4	18
	41.26		30.74		
Medium		40		32	72
	46.44		34.58		
Large		44		37	81
Total		98		73	171

$X^2 = 3.46 \quad p < .20$

selected those titles less frequently than all colleges together with a range of 33.8% for faculty to 77.8% for presidents. Differences for all respondents based on size were significant at the .001 level as shown in Table 14.

By medians for size groups. Numbers of different final decision makers named by decision (Table 15) were different based on size alone as might be expected. The median number of different choices in small colleges was 1.77, in medium colleges, 4.29, and in large colleges 4.71.

As shown in Table 16, differences by size were significant at the .001 level when small, medium, and large were compared together. Closer inspection, however, indicated that the distribution for small colleges

Table 14. Choice Of President, Vice President or Academic Dean As Final Decision Maker By College Size

	Response		
	President Vice President Academic Dean	All Other Responses	Total
Small	136.8 159	79.2 57	216
Medium	353.4 378	204.6 180	558
Large	364.8 318	211.2 258	576
Total	855	495	1350

$X^2 = 30.87$ $p < .001$

accounted for nearly all of the variance. No difference was found between medium and large colleges.

By medians for status groups. Medians by status for small, medium, and large colleges are shown in Table 15. When an attempt was made to apply the extension of the median test to compare status groups within size categories, it proved impossible. In all size groups, all faculty responses were above the common median which produced empty cells, thus invalidating the test. Combination of faculty and department chairmen categories was judged not feasible because, except in the case of medium colleges, medians of the two groups were not similar enough. No appropriate statistical test was found, so statistical significance cannot be discussed. However,

Table 15. Number Of Different Decision-Makers Named By Size And By Status

Small Colleges

Decision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Median
Faculty	4	4	6	4	5	4	7	4	3	4.20
Dept. Ch.	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.40
Bus. Ofcr.	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.60
V. Pres.	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1.40
Pres.	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1.25

Combined Median 1.77

Medium Colleges

Decision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Median
Faculty	5	6	6	5	6	7	6	5	5	5.63
Dept. Ch.	6	4	8	6	7	7	5	5	4	5.75
Bus. Ofcr.	3	3	3	3	6	3	4	4	1	3.20
V. Pres.	4	4	6	4	2	4	4	4	1	4.50
Pres.	3	2	5	3	5	4	4	3	3	3.38

Combined Median 4.29

Large Colleges

Decision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Median
Faculty	7	6	8	5	6	5	7	7	6	6.33
Dept. Ch.	3	5	7	5	7	4	7	7	3	5.33
Bus. Ofcr.	4	2	5	3	5	3	4	6	2	3.75
V. Pres.	4	3	5	5	3	4	7	5	2	4.25
Pres.	3	2	5	3	5	3	4	3	2	3.13

Combined Median 4.71

Table 16. Numbers of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Size

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Small	23.66 8	21.34 37	45
Medium	23.66 32	21.34 13	45
Large	23.66 31	21.34 14	45
Total	71	64	135

$X^2 = 32.86 \quad p < .001$

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Medium	31.5 32	13.5 13	45
Large	31.5 31	13.5 14	45
Total	63	27	90

$X^2 = .03 \quad p < .99$

inspection of frequency distributions (Table 17) disclosed large and obvious distributional differences.

In small colleges, faculty never named less than 3 different decision makers. By contrast, business officers, vice presidents, and presidents named no more than 2 different decision makers. In medium and large colleges the differences were less extreme but quite large nonetheless, enough so that status differences within each size group appeared significant on the face.

Table 17. Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Status And By Size: Frequency Distributions

Small Colleges
Status

No. Named	Faculty		Chm.		Bus. Ofcr.		V. Pres.		Pres.		All	
8												
7	1	9									1	45
6	1	8									1	44
5	1	7									1	43
4	5	6									5	42
3	1	1	4	9							5	37
2			5	5	1	9	4	9	3	9	13	32
1					8	8	5	5	6	6	19	19
Median	4.20		2.40		1.60		1.40		1.25		1.77	

Medium Colleges
Status

No. Named	Faculty		Chm.		Bus. Ofcr.		V. Pres.		Pres.		All	
8			1	9							1	45
7	1	9	2	8							3	44
6	4	8	2	6	1	9	1	9			8	41
5	4	4	2	4	0	8	0	8	2	9	8	33
4			2	2	2	8	6	8	2	7	12	25
3					5	6	0	2	4	5	9	13
2					0	1	1	2	1	1	2	4
1					1	1	1	1			2	2
Median	5.61		5.75		3.2		4.5		3.38		4.29	

Table 17--continued

Large Colleges
Status

No. Named	Faculty		Chm.		Bus. Ofcr.		V. Pres.		Pres.		All	
8	1	9									1	43
7	3	8	4	9			1	9			8	44
6	3	5	0	5	1	9	0	8			4	36
5	2	2	3	5	2	8	3	8	2	9	12	32
4			1	2	2	6	2	5	1	7	6	20
3			1	1	2	4	2	3	4	6	9	14
2					2	2	1	1	2	2	5	5
1												
Median	6.33		5.33		3.75		4.25		3.13		4.71	

By medians for instructional and funding decisions groups. When numbers of different final decision makers were examined by instructional and funding decision groups for small, medium, and large colleges, no significant differences were found within groups. As can be seen in Table 18, small and large college respondents tended to name slightly fewer different final decision makers when the decision was one of funding while medium college respondents named slightly more.

Faculty as final decision maker

Choice of faculty as final decision maker also tended to vary by size of college. In small colleges, 3.4% of the faculty named the faculty as final decision maker, less than the 6.6% for all colleges, while in medium and large

Table 18. Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Size: Medians For Instructional And Funding Decisions

	Decision Type	
	Instructional	Funding
Small	1.88	1.50
Medium	4.60	5.07
Large	4.91	4.50

colleges the percentages were 7.6 and 7.4 respectively, larger than for all colleges. In addition, in medium and large colleges, a few chairmen (4.6% and 2.6%), business officers (1.9% and 1.1%) and vice presidents (1.0% and 1.0%) joined in naming faculty as final decision maker, in small colleges, no respondent other than faculty perceived faculty to have final decision making authority.

When size was considered, only in large colleges was faculty choice of faculty as final decision maker found to be significantly different from choice of faculty by all respondents ($p < .02$). In small and medium colleges, no difference was found (Table 19).

"Don't know final decision maker" responses

"Don't know" responses by status seemed to be related to size also. Faculty in each size group tended to respond "Don't know" more frequently than other respondents, but in small colleges the percentage for

Table 19. Perceptions Of Faculty As Final Decision Maker Comparing Faculty To All Respondents By College Size

Small Colleges

	Final Decision Maker Named		Total
	Faculty	All Other Responses	
Faculty	2.81 4	114.19 113	117
All Respondents	5.19 4	210.81 212	216
Total	8	325	333

$X^2 = .80 \quad p < .40$

Medium Colleges

	Final Decision Maker Named		Total
	Faculty	All Other Responses	
Faculty	11.78 17	213.22 208	225
All Respondents	29.22 24	528.78 534	558
Total	41	742	783

$X^2 = 3.43 \quad p < .10$

Large Colleges

	Final Decision Maker Named		Total
	Faculty	All Other Responses	
Faculty	8.15 14	180.85 175	189
All Respondents	24.85 19	551.15 557	576
Total	33	732	765

$X^2 = 5.83 \quad p < .02$

faculty (6.8%) was much closer to other status levels within that size group (chairmen, 4.4%; business officers, 5.6%; vice presidents, 5.6%; presidents, 0) than was the case in medium or large colleges. Medium size college faculty responded "Don't know" 17.8% of the time compared with 9.3% for department chairmen, 0 for business officers, 3.0% for vice presidents, and 2.8% for presidents. Large college faculty responded "Don't know" with even greater frequency, 30.7% as compared to 10.3% for department chairmen. 10.0% for business officers, and 0 for vice presidents and presidents. Size alone also seemed to have an overall relationship to frequency of "Don't know" responses. All small college respondents replied "Don't know" only 5.6% of the time while for all medium college respondents the percentage was 9.9% and for all large college respondents it was 13.7%.

By size alone. When "Don't know" responses for all respondents were tested by college size (Table 20), a difference based on size significant at the .01 level was found, with small and medium college respondents less likely to reply "Don't know" than expected and large college respondents more likely than expected to so respond.

By status groups. Within each size group, faculty "Don't know" responses were tested against "Don't know" responses of all respondents (Table 21). Faculty responded

Table 20. "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses By College Size

	Response Don't Know	 All Other Responses	Total
Small	23.36 12	192.64 204	216
Medium	60.35 55	497.65 503	558
Large	62.29 79	513.71 497	576
Total	146	1204	1350

$X^2 = 11.75$ $p < .01$

"Don't know" significantly more often than expected in medium colleges ($p < .01$) and in large colleges ($p < .001$). No difference was found in small colleges.

When the proportions of faculty in each size group responding "Don't know" were directly compared (Table 22), differences significant at the .001 level were found, with faculty in small colleges responding "Don't know" far less frequently than might be expected and faculty in large colleges so responding much more frequently than expected.

Findings for Colleges Grouped by Organizational Type

Community colleges in Florida are one of two distinct organizational types. Single campus colleges have one physical location at which the majority of their educational activities are carried out and one coherent administrative structure. Multicampus colleges have two or more

Table 21. "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Faculty And All Respondents By College Size

Small Colleges

	Response				
	Don't Know		All Other Responses		Total
Faculty	7.03	8	109.97	109	117
All Respondents	12.97	12	203.03	204	216
Total		20			333

$X^2 = .22 \quad p < .90$

Medium Colleges

	Response				
	Don't Know		All Other Responses		Total
Faculty	27.3	40	197.7	185	225
All Respondents	67.7	55	490.3	503	588
Total		95		688	783

$X^2 = 9.44 \quad p < .01$

Large Colleges

	Response				
	Don't Know		All Other Responses		Total
Faculty	33.85	58	155.15	131	189
All Respondents	103.15	79	472.85	497	576
Total		137		628	765

$X^2 = 27.88 \quad p < .001$

Table 22. "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Small, Medium And Large College Faculty

	Response		
	Don't Know	All Other Responses	Total
Small Faculty	23.36 8	93.64 109	117
Medium Faculty	44.92 40	180.08 185	225
Large Faculty	37.73 58	151.27 131	189
Total	106	425	531

$X^2 = 26.90$ $p < .001$

distinct physical plants with varying but relatively diffuse administrative structures. When colleges were categorized by type, the single campus group contained 4 small, 11 medium and 4 large campus colleges. One medium and 8 large colleges comprised the multicampus category.

President as final decision maker

By organizational type alone. Choices of the president as final decision maker for all respondents by organizational type were quite similar to each other and to corresponding percentages for all colleges (Table 23). No significant differences were found between multicampus and single campus distributions nor between each organization type compared to distributions for all colleges.

The percentage of responses clustered around the three most commonly named final decision makers--president,

Table 23. Perceived Final Decision Maker By Organizational Type

Multicampus

Decision Maker*

Status	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%
Faculty	48	33.3	1	.7	1	.7	0	0	6	4.2	9	6.3	0	0
Dept. Ch.	17	21.0	12	14.8	0	0	0	0	20	24.7	3	3.7	3	3.7
Bus. Ofcr.	48	59.3	6	7.4	0	0	0	0	7	8.6	5	6.2	0	0
Vice Pres.	38	52.8	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	3	4.2	3	4.2	0	0
President	32	59.3	10	18.5	0	0	0	0	2	3.7	10	18.5	0	0
Total	183	42.4	30	6.9	1	.2	0	0	38	8.8	30	6.9	3	.7

Single Campus

Decision Maker

Faculty	125	32.3	30	7.8	8	2.1	1	.2	29	7.5	0	0	0	0
Dept. Ch.	68	36.0	16	8.5	3	1.6	0	0	11	5.8	0	0	0	0
Bus. Ofcr.	53	65.4	11	13.6	2	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vice Pres.	73	50.7	16	11.1	0	0	0	0	2	1.4	1	.7	0	0
President	66	56.4	13	11.1	0	0	0	0	5	4.3	5	4.3	0	0
Total	385	41.9	86	9.4	13	1.4	1	.1	47	5.1	6	.7	0	0

Table 23--continued

Multicampus

Decision Maker*

Status	8	%	9	%	10	%	11	%	12	%	13	%	N	1,2,8
Faculty	4	2.8	5	3.5	11	7.6	4	2.8	11	7.6	44	30.6	144	36.8
Dept. Ch.	5	6.2	3	3.7	5	6.2	5	6.2	1	1.2	7	8.6	81	42.0
Bus. Ofcr.	1	1.2	0	0	9	11.1	1	1.2	1	1.2	3	3.7	81	67.9
Vice Pres.	9	12.5	1	1.4	3	4.2	13	18.1	1	1.4	0	0	72	66.7
President	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	77.8
Total	19	4.4	9	2.1	28	6.5	23	5.3	14	3.2	54	12.5	432	

Single Campus

Decision Maker

Faculty	62	16.0	1	.2	19	4.9	26	6.7	24	6.2	62	16.0	387	56.1
Dept. Ch.	40	21.2	10	5.3	10	5.3	7	3.7	7	3.7	17	9.0	189	65.7
Bus. Ofcr.	6	7.4	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	1	1.2	7	8.6	81	86.4
Vice Pres.	32	22.2	0	0	13	9.0	2	1.4	1	.7	4	2.8	144	84.0
President	13	11.1	1	.9	9	7.7	3	2.7	0	0	2	1.7	117	78.6
Total	153	16.7	12	1.3	52	5.7	38	4.1	33	3.6	92	10.0	918	

* 1. President
2. Institutional Academic Vice President
3. Chief Business Officer
4. Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
5. Institutional Curriculum Committee
6. Chief Campus Administrator
7. Campus Academic Vice President
8. Academic Dean
9. Campus Curriculum Committee
10. Division Chairperson
11. Department Chairperson
12. Faculty Peers
13. Don't Know

vice president, and academic dean--differed for each organizational type (Table 23). Single campus status groups uniformly named one of those three titles more frequently than their counterparts in multicampus colleges. The difference based on type alone was significant at the .001 level (Table 24).

Table 24. Choice of President, Vice President, or Academic Dean As Final Decision Maker By Organizational Type

	Response		
	President Vice President, Academic Dean	All Other Responses	Total
Multicampus	273.92 232	158.08 200	432
Single Campus	582.08 624	335.92 294	918
Total	856	494	1350

$X^2 = 25.78$ $p < .001$

By status groups. Percentages of respondents at each status level naming the president final decision maker were, for both multi- and single campus groups, quite similar to the corresponding percentages for all colleges as well as being quite similar to each other. The only notable difference was for department chairmen. In multicampus colleges, only 21.0% of chairmen named the president final decision maker while in single campus colleges, 36.0% did so. The difference between responses of multicampus chairmen and single campus chairmen was significant at the .02 level (Table 25).

Table 25. Perceptions Of President As Final Decision Maker Comparing Chairmen By Organizational Type

	Response		
	President	All Other Responses	Total
Multicampus Chairmen	25.5 17	55.5 64	81
Single Campus Chairmen	59.5 68	129.5 121	189
Total	85	185	270

$X^2 = 5.90 \quad p < .02$

Number of different final decision makers named

By medians for organizational type alone. As shown in Table 26, numbers of different final decision makers named varied somewhat by organizational type. Generally, respondents in single campus colleges tended to name more different final decision makers for each decision than did multicampus respondents. Median number of different final decision makers named by respondents in multicampus colleges was 3.82 and 4.92 for single campus colleges. The one exception was business officers; single campus business officers generally showed more agreement with other group respondents as to final decision maker than did their multicampus counterparts.

Table 26. Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Type, By Status, And By Decision

Multicampus Colleges

Decision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Median
Faculty	5	5	7	4	4	4	6	5	4	4.67
Dept. Ch.	3	5	4	5	6	3	5	7	2	4.67
Bus. Ofcr.	4	3	5	3	6	3	4	5	2	3.75
Vice Pres.	3	3	5	4	2	4	6	4	2	3.67
Presidents	2	2	3	2	4	2	3	3	2	2.40
							Common Median			3.82

Single Campus Colleges

Decision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Median
Faculty	6	7	7	7	7	8	8	7	5	7.00
Dept. Ch.	6	5	8	6	8	7	7	6	5	6.33
Bus. Ofcr.	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	1	2.88
Vice Pres.	4	4	6	4	5	4	4	5	3	4.20
Presidents	4	3	7	4	6	5	6	4	3	4.33
							Common Median			4.92

Differences in medians between multicampus and single campus colleges were found to be significant at the .05 level for all respondents (Table 27).

By medians for status groups. Not only was there less agreement on final decision maker among all respondents in single campus colleges than in multicampus colleges, there was also a large status difference within single

Table 27. Number of Different Final Decision Makers Named By Organizational Type

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Multicampus	20 15	25 30	45
Single Campus	20 25	25 20	45
Total	40	50	90

$X^2 = 4.5$ $p < .05$

campus colleges, with medians by status group ranging from 7.0 for faculty to 2.88 for business officers (Table 26). Some status differences were observable in multicampus colleges, but the range of medians was much smaller, from 4.67 for faculty and also department chairmen to 2.40 for presidents. As was the case with the size group comparison of number of final decision makers named, all faculty responses in both multicampus and single campus groups were above the median for all respondents in each organizational type group, so no statistical test was possible. By the same logic applied previously, however, it was judged that when all responses for a status group lay above the common median, there was prima facie evidence of significance of difference.

By medians for instructional and funding decision groups. Table 28 displays medians for responses grouped by instructional decisions and finding decisions. No

Table 28. Number Of Different Final Decision Makers Named: Medians For Instructional And Funding Decisions By Organizational Type

	Decision Type	
	Instructional	Funding
Multicampus	3.92	3.70
Single Campus	5.33	4.50

difference was found in medians within groups or between groups.

Faculty as final decision maker

In the selection of faculty as final decision maker, there were not notable differences between single campus and multicampus groups. Department chairmen in single campus colleges tended to name faculty somewhat more frequently than chairmen in multicampus colleges by 3.7% to 1.2%, but generally, totals for the two groups were similar to each other and to the totals for all colleges.

"Don't know final decision maker" responses

By organizational type alone. Organizational type alone had no significant relationship to the tendency to respond "Don't know final decision maker" (Table 29). However, within type groups, status differences appeared.

By status groups. Faculty in multicampus colleges were nearly twice as likely (30.6% to 16.0%) to respond "Don't know" as faculty in single campus colleges. By contrast, presidents and vice presidents in multicampus

Table 29. "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Response By Organizational Type

	Response		
	Don't Know	All Other Responses	Total
Multicampus	46.72 54	385.28 378	432
Single Campus	99.28 92	818.72 826	918
Total	146	1204	1350

$X^2 = 1.87 \quad p < .20$

colleges did not respond "Don't know" a single time; in single campus colleges, however, 2.8% of vice presidents and 1.7% of presidents answered "Don't know."

The number of faculty responses of "Don't know" compared to all respondents in both organizational type groups was significant at the .001 level in each case (Table 30), the same as for all colleges together. When the proportion of faculty in multicampus colleges responding "Don't know" was compared to the proportion of single campus faculty so responding, that difference also was found to be significant at the .001 level, as shown in Table 31.

Table 30. "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Faculty And All Respondents By Organizational Type

Multicampus Colleges

	Response		
	Don't Know	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	13.5 44	130.5 100	144
All Respondents	40.5 10	391.5 422	432
Total	54	522	576

$X^2 = 99.00 \quad p < .001$

Single Campus Colleges

	Response		
	Don't Know	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	27.28 62	359.72 325	387
All Respondents	64.72 30	853.28 888	918
Total	92		1305

$X^2 = 67.58 \quad p < .001$

Table 31. "Don't Know Final Decision Maker" Responses Comparing Multicampus Faculty And Single Campus Faculty

	Response		
	Don't Know	All Other Responses	Total
Multicampus Faculty	28.75 44	115.25 100	144
Single Campus Faculty	77.25 62	307.75 325	387
Total	106	425	531

$X^2 = 13.87 \quad p < .001$

Perceptions as to Number of Other Participants

If a structured attempt to influence a curriculum change decision is to be made, it is not enough to know who makes the final decisions. Knowing something about others who are officially involved in the decision process is also important. Therefore, in addition to identifying the final decision maker, respondents were asked to identify, from the same list of titles, other persons or groups known to have input into the decision making process. Responses for all respondents ranged from "No others" to "Nine others." Thirty-two respondents marked marked the "Don't know" response with the symbol used to identify other participants. Since the questionnaire was designed to collect perceptual information, it was determined that a "Don't know" response was effectively the same as a "No others" response and was so recorded.

Findings for All Colleges

"No other participants" responses

By all respondents. The frequency of choice of each number of participants from 0 (no others) to 9 (nine others) by status group for all decisions is displayed in Table 32. The most frequent response for all respondents over all decisions was 0, or "No others," for 20.5% of the total. The next most frequent response was "two others," 20.0% of the total. "One other" and "three others"

Table 32. Number of Participants Named: All Colleges And All Decisions By Status

Status	Number of Participants Named 0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%
Faculty	169	31.8	98	18.5	99	18.6	71	13.4	47	8.9	23	4.3	16	3.0
Dept. Ch.	55	20.4	42	15.6	51	18.9	52	10.4	28	10.4	22	8.1	12	4.4
Bus. Ofcr.	19	11.7	39	24.1	34	21.0	25	15.4	22	13.6	11	6.8	8	4.9
Vice Pres.	24	11.1	43	19.9	38	17.6	40	18.5	27	12.5	18	8.3	7	3.2
President	10	5.8	22	12.9	48	28.1	35	20.5	19	11.1	14	8.2	7	4.1
Total	277	20.5	244	18.1	270	20.0	223	16.5	143	10.6	88	6.5	50	3.7

Status	Number of Participants Named 7	%	8	%	9	%	N	Median
Faculty	7	.4	4	.8	2	.4	531	1.48
Dept. Ch.	6	2.2	1	.4	1	.4	270	2.25
Bus. Ofcr.	0	0	0	0	4	2.5	162	2.17
Vice Pres.	13	6.0	3	1.4	3	1.4	216	2.58
President	11	6.4	3	1.8	2	1.2	171	2.66
Total	32	2.4	11	.8	12	.9	1350	2.07

received 18.1% and 16.5% respectively. Responses 0 to 3 inclusive accounted for 75.0% of the total.

By status groups. By far the most frequent response for faculty was "No other participants," which was chosen 31.8% of the time. Department chairmen so responded 20.4% of the time, business officers and vice presidents 11.7% and 11.1% of the time respectively, and presidents only 5.8% of the time. Differences by status group in the tendency to perceive no participation in decision making were highly significant at the .001 level (Table 33).

Table 33. "No Other Participants" Responses Comparing Status Groups For All Decisions And All Colleges

	Response		
	No Others	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	108.95 169	422.05 362	531
Dept. Chairmen	55.40 55	214.60 215	270
Business Officers	33.24 19	128.76 143	162
Vice President	44.32 24	171.68 192	216
President	35.09 10	135.91 161	171
Total	277	1073	1350

$X^2 = 83.61$ $p < .001$

Number of other participants

By medians for status groups. Medians for status groups show that faculty tend to perceive fewer participants other than the final decision maker than other groups. Presidents and vice presidents see the most involvement of others. Over all decisions, the median for faculty was 1.48; for department chairmen, 2.25; for business officers, 2.17; for vice presidents, 2.58; and for presidents, 2.66. Compared to the common median of 2.07 for all status groups, only the faculty median was lower; medians for all other status groups were above the common median. Reference to Table 32 shows that the mode for faculty and chairmen was 0, for business officers and vice presidents it was 1, and for presidents the mode was 2. Zero responses for faculty constituted 31.8% of the group total; for chairmen, 20.4%; for business officers, 11.7%; for vice presidents, 11.1%; and for presidents 5.8%. Differences from the common median for the five status groups were significant at the .001 level. (Table 34).

By medians for instructional and funding decision groups. Decisions 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 were basically instructional decisions; 2, 4, 6, and 8 were funding decisions. Data were recast to determine whether or not there were perceived differences in number of participants depending on the type of decision involved. The median for instructional decisions was 2.57 while the median for funding

Table 34. Number Of Other Participants Named: All Colleges And All Decisions Comparing Status Levels

	Above Median		Below Median		Total
Faculty	219.87	165	311.13	366	531
Department Chairmen	111.80	122	158.20	148	270
Business Officers	67.08	70	94.92	92	162
Vice Presidents	89.44	111	126.56	105	216
Presidents	70.80	91	100.20	80	171
Total		559		791	1350

$X^2 = 43.88 \quad p < .001$

decisions was only 1.55 other participants. Frequency distributions displayed in Table 35 illustrate two major distributional differences between the two groups. First, the mode for instructional decisions is 3 while the mode for funding decisions is 0. Second, over one-quarter (26.8%) of respondents indicated that they believed funding decisions to be unilateral while only 15.5% believed that to be true of instructional decisions.

Differences in medians for curriculum decisions compared with funding decisions proved to be significant at the .001 level (Table 36) with curriculum decisions perceived to involve significantly more other participants than funding decisions.

Table 35. Number Of Participants Named By Type Of Decision: Frequency Distributions

No. Named	Decision Instructional		Funding	
9	9	750	3	600
8	7	741	4	597
7	21	734	11	595
6	29	713	21	582
5	70	684	18	561
4	94	614	49	543
3	156	520	67	494
2	137	364	133	427
1	111	227	133	294
0	116	116	161	161
Median	2.57		1.55	

Table 36. Number Of Participants Named By Type Of Decision Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Instructional Decisions	310.56 386	439.44 364	750
Funding Decisions	248.44 173	351.56 427	600
Total	559	791	1350

$X^2 = 70.37 \quad p < .001$

Findings for Colleges Grouped by Size

Totals of number of participants named for all decisions were regrouped by college size and are displayed in Table 37. Inspection of the totals for all respondents

Table 37. Number Of Participants Named For All Decisions By Size And By Status

Small Colleges - Number of Participants

Status	0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	N	Median
Faculty	14	12.0	31	26.5	21	17.9	28	23.9	16	13.7	4	3.0	2	1.7	1	0.9	0	0	0	0	117	2.14
Dept. Ch	4	8.9	10	22.2	9	20.0	14	31.1	7	15.6	1	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	2.44
Bus. Ofcr.	1	5.6	6	33.3	7	38.9	4	22.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	1.79
Vice Pres.	1	5.6	4	22.2	3	16.7	10	55.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	2.60
President	0	0	7	38.9	7	38.9	4	22.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	1.79
Total	20	9.3	58	26.9	47	21.8	60	27.8	23	10.6	5	2.5	2	0.9	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	216	2.14

Medium Colleges - Number of Participants

Status	0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	N	Median
Faculty	76	33.8	39	17.3	39	17.3	19	8.4	21	9.3	12	5.3	13	5.8	0	0	4	1.8	2	0.9	225	1.44
Dept. Ch.	24	22.2	16	14.8	19	17.6	18	16.7	6	5.6	12	11.1	8	7.4	5	4.6	0	0	0	0	108	2.24
Bus. Ofcr.	4	7.4	19	35.2	14	25.9	4	7.4	9	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7.4	54	1.79
Vice Pres.	16	16.2	23	23.2	18	18.2	18	18.2	14	14.1	6	6.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	1	1.0	0	0	99	2.08
President	8	11.1	8	11.1	23	31.9	17	23.6	10	13.9	1	1.4	1	1.4	4	5.6	0	0	0	0	72	2.37
Total	128	22.9	105	18.8	113	20.3	76	13.6	60	10.8	31	5.6	23	4.1	11	2.0	5	0.9	6	1.1	558	1.91

Large Colleges - Number of Participants

Status	0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	N	Median
Faculty	79	41.8	28	14.8	39	20.6	24	12.7	10	5.3	7	3.7	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	189	1.05
Dept. Ch.	27	23.1	16	13.7	23	19.7	20	17.1	15	12.8	9	7.7	4	3.4	1	0.9	1	0.9	1	0.9	117	2.17
Bus. Ofcr.	14	15.6	14	15.6	13	14.4	17	18.9	13	14.4	11	12.2	8	8.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	2.74
Vice Pres.	7	7.0	16	16.2	17	17.2	12	12.1	13	13.1	12	12.1	6	6.0	11	11.1	2	2.0	3	3.0	99	3.29
Pres.	2	2.5	7	8.6	18	22.2	14	17.2	9	11.1	13	16.0	6	7.4	7	8.6	3	3.7	2	2.5	81	3.55
Total	129	22.4	81	14.1	110	19.1	87	15.1	60	10.4	52	9.0	25	4.3	20	3.5	6	1.0	6	1.0	576	2.21

in each size group showed some variations in perceptions of numbers of other participants which appeared to be related to size.

"No other participants" responses

Whereas in all colleges together "No other participants" was selected 20.5% of the time, in the by-size totals, it became apparent that while responses from medium (22.9%) and large (22.4%) colleges were similar to each other and all colleges together, small college totals for "0" response in small colleges was "3" with 27.8%, followed by "1" (26.9%) and "2" (21.8%). In medium and large colleges, no category except "0" was larger than 20.3% of the total for the group.

By size alone. When responses of "No other participants" were compared by small, medium and large colleges (Table 38), respondents in small colleges were found to

Table 38. "No Other Participants" Responses For All Decisions By Size Group

	Response		
	No Others	All Other Responses	Total
Small	44.32 20	171.68 196	216
Medium	114.49 128	443.51 430	558
Large	118.19 129	457.81 447	576
Total	277	1073	1350

$X^2 = 18.97 \quad p < .001$

respond "No others" significantly less frequently and respondents in medium and large colleges significantly more frequently than could be expected ($p < .001$).

By status group. Size did not appear to be closely related to status group differences within groups. Faculty uniformly responded "No others" more frequently than all other status groups; presidents less frequently than all others except in medium colleges in which business officers responded "No others" least frequently. Between size groups, status group patterns followed that of all respondents by size. That is, all status groups in small colleges responded "No others" less frequently than their counterparts in medium or large colleges. Faculty in small colleges responded "No others" 12% of the time; faculty in medium colleges, 33.8% of the time; and faculty in large colleges 41.8% of the time. The pattern was the same for department chairmen and business officers. For vice presidents and presidents, however, the largest percentages of "No others" responses were in medium, not large, colleges.

Number of other participants

By medians for size groups. Respondents from small and large colleges tended to perceive more participants, with medians of 2.14 and 2.2 respectively, than did respondents from medium size colleges, median 1.91. Differences in medians among size groups was not statistically significant, however (Table 39).

Table 39. Number Of Other Participants Named For All Decisions Comparing Medians For Small, Medium And Large

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Small	89.44 91	126.56 125	216
Medium	231.05 212	326.95 346	558
Large	238.51 256	337.49 320	576
Total	559	791	1350

$X^2 = 4.92$ $p < .20$

By median for status groups. Status differences by size also were observable (Table 37). Faculty medians decreased from 2.14 for small college faculty to 1.44 for medium college faculty to 1.05 for large college faculty. Conversely, medians for presidents climbed from 1.79 for small college presidents to 2.37 for medium college presidents to 3.55 for large college presidents.

When medians for faculty in small, medium, and large colleges were compared to the common faculty median of 1.48, differences were found to be significant at the .01 level, wtih small college faculty naming more and large college faculty naming fewer other participants in decision making (Table 40).

Comparisons of medians for faculty with medians for all respondents within size groups (Table 41) indicated that in large and medium colleges, faculty medians were

Table 40. Number of Other Participants Named Comparing Faculty Medians By Size

	Above Medians	Below Medians	Total
Small	58.17 72	58.83 45	117
Medium	111.86 110	113.14 115	225
Large	93.97 82	95.03 107	189
Total	264	267	531

$X^2 = 9.63$ $p < .01$

significantly less than expected, $p < .001$ and $p < .02$ respectively. There was no difference between the faculty median and the median for all respondents in small colleges.

When medians for number of other participants named by presidents were compared by size to the common median for all presidents (Table 42), differences in medians were significant at the .001 level, with small and medium college presidents naming more than would be expected.

Similarity between certain status groups was also noted from Table 37. Medians for academic vice presidents were consistently larger than medians for their respective size groups while faculty medians were uniformly less than group medians.

By medians for instructional and funding decision groups. When data were recast to compare instructional decisions with funding decisions for small, medium, and large colleges, median numbers of other participants

Table 41. Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Faculty Medians And All Respondent Medians By Size

Small Colleges

	Above Medians	Below Medians	Total
Faculty	49.89 51	61.11 66	117
All Respondents	92.11 91	123.89 125	216
Total	142	191	333

$X^2 = .07 \quad p < .80$

Medium Colleges

	Above Medians	Below Medians	Total
Faculty	125 110	100 233	225
All Respondents	310 325	248 233	558
Total	435	348	783

$X^2 = 5.68 \quad p < .02$

Large Colleges

	Above Medians	Below Medians	Total
Faculty	73.87 43	115.13 146	189
All Respondents	225.13 256	350.87 320	576
Total	299	466	765

$X^2 = 28.13 \quad p < .001$

Table 42. Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Medians For Presidents By Size

	Above Medians	Below Medians	Total
Small	9.68 4	8.32 14	18
Medium	38.74 33	33.76 39	72
Large	43.58 55	37.42 26	81
Total	92	79	171

$X^2 = 15.35 \quad p < .001$

named for instructional decisions for each group were consistently larger than medians for funding decisions (table 43). Differences between medians for instructional decisions and those for funding decisions were significant in small colleges at the .05 level, and in medium and large colleges at the .001 level as shown in Table 44.

Findings For Colleges Grouped By Organizational Type

Responses as to number of other participants in decision making were tabulated by multicampus and single campus in response to the study question: Is the organizational type of the institution related to perceptions of organizational members in different status groups regarding the number of persons of groups who are involved in decisions?

Table 43. Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Size --Frequency Distribution

Small Colleges
Decision

No. Named	Instructional		Funding	
9				
8				
7			1	96
6			2	95
5	5	120	0	93
4	15	115	8	93
3	38	100	22	85
2	26	62	21	63
1	28	36	30	42
0	8	8	12	12
Median	2.42		1.78	

Medium Colleges
Decision

No. Named	Instructional		Funding	
9	4	310	2	248
8	3	306	2	246
7	6	303	5	244
6	14	297	9	239
5	27	283	4	230
4	39	256	21	226
3	60	217	16	205
2	53	157	60	189
1	51	104	54	129
0	53	53	75	75
Median	2.46		1.41	

Large Colleges
Decision

No. Named	Instructional		Funding	
9	5	320	1	256
8	4	315	2	255
7	15	311	5	253
6	15	296	10	248
5	38	281	14	238
4	40	243	21	224
3	58	203	29	203
2	58	145	52	174
1	32	87	49	122
0	55	55	73	73
Median	2.76		1.62	

Table 44. Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Size

Small Colleges

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Instructional	50.56 58	69.44 62	120
Funding	40.44 33	55.56 63	96
Total	91	125	216

$X^2 = 4.26 \quad p < .05$

Medium Colleges

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Instructional	180.56 206	129.44 104	310
Funding	144.44 119	104.56 129	248
Total	325	233	558

$X^2 = 19.31 \quad p < .001$

Large Colleges

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Instructional	142.78 175	177.22 145	320
Funding	114.22 82	141.78 174	256
Total	257	319	576

$X^2 = 29.54 \quad p < .001$

"No other participants" responses

By organizational type alone. Generally, respondents in multicampus colleges were more likely to respond "No others," 22.6% for all status groups, than were respondents from single campus colleges, 19.4% (Table 45). The difference was not significant, however.

By status groups. When all status groups were compared together, differences in responses of "No others" were significant at the .001 level for both multicampus and single campus groups (Table 46). When status groups were compared individually, however, organizational type appeared to be related only to the greater tendency of business officers to indicate no perceived participation in decision making. No differences were found between faculty, department chairmen, vice president and president groups based on organizational type. Business officers in multicampus colleges, however, were significantly more likely to respond "No others" than expected while their colleagues in single campus colleges were significantly less likely to so respond ($p < .01$ as shown in Table 47).

Number of other participants

By medians for organization type groups. The median number of other participants named by all respondents in multicampus colleges was 2.01 and in single campus colleges, 2.10, compared to a combined median of 2.07 for multicampus and single campus colleges together.

Table 45. Number Of Participants Named For All Decisions By Organizational Type And By Status

Multicampus

Number of Participants

Status	0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	N	Median
Faculty	57	39.6	21	14.6	25	17.4	14	9.7	9	6.2	5	3.5	6	4.2	1	0.6	4	2.8	2	1.4	144	1.21
Dept. Ch.	20	24.7	16	19.8	14	17.3	12	14.8	5	6.2	7	8.6	4	4.9	1	1.2	1	1.2	1	1.2	81	1.82
Bus. Ofcr.	13	16.0	23	28.4	16	19.8	13	16.0	9	11.1	5	6.2	2	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	1.78
Vice Pres.	7	9.7	13	18.1	16	22.2	9	12.5	10	13.9	4	5.6	5	6.9	3	4.2	2	2.8	3	4.2	72	2.50
President	1	1.9	2	3.7	13	24.1	9	16.7	9	16.7	2	3.7	6	11.1	7	13.0	3	5.6	2	3.7	54	3.72
Total	98	22.7	75	17.4	84	19.4	57	13.2	42	9.7	23	5.3	23	5.3	12	2.8	10	2.3	8	1.9	432	2.01

Single Campus

Number of Participants

Status	0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%	N	Median
Faculty	112	28.9	77	19.9	74	19.1	57	14.7	38	9.8	18	4.7	10	2.3	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	387	1.56
Dept. Ch.	35	18.5	26	13.8	37	19.6	40	21.2	23	12.2	15	7.9	8	4.2	5	2.6	0	0	0	0	189	2.41
Bus. Ofcr.	6	7.4	16	19.8	18	22.2	12	14.8	13	16.0	6	7.4	6	7.4	0	0	0	0	4	4.9	81	2.54
Vice Pres.	17	11.8	30	20.8	22	15.3	31	21.5	17	11.8	14	9.7	2	1.4	10	6.9	1	0.7	0	0	144	2.60
President	9	7.7	20	17.1	35	29.9	26	22.2	10	8.5	12	10.3	1	0.9	4	3.4	0	0	0	0	117	2.37
Total	179	19.5	169	18.4	166	18.4	166	18.1	101	18.1	65	7.1	27	2.9	20	2.2	1	0.1	4	0.4	918	2.10

Table 46. "No Other Participants" Responses Comparing All Status Groups By Organizational Type

Multicampus

	No Other	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	32.67 57	111.53 87	144
Department Chairmen	18.38 20	62.62 61	81
Business Officers	18.38 13	62.62 68	81
Vice Presidents	16.33 7	55.67 65	72
Presidents	12.25 1	41.75 53	54
Total	98	334	432

$X^2 = 44.06$ $p < .001$

Single Campus

	No Other	All Other Responses	Total
Faculty	75.46 112	311.54 275	387
Department Chairmen	36.85 35	152.15 154	189
Business Officers	15.79 6	65.21 75	81
Vice Presidents	28.08 17	115.92 127	144
Presidents	22.81 9	44.19 108	117
Total	179	739	918

$X^2 = 43.43$ $p < .001$

Table 47. "No Other Participants" Responses Comparing Business Officers By Multicampus And Single Campus Colleges

	No Other	All Other Responses	Total
Multicampus	6.72 13	91.28 85	98
Single Campus	12.28 6	166.72 173	179
Total	19	258	277

$X^2 = 9.75$ $p < .01$

While for all respondents differences in medians based on organizational type were small, differences between multicampus and single campus medians by status group varied somewhat more.

By medians for status groups. In multicampus colleges, median number of other participants ranged from 1.21 for faculty to 3.72 for presidents; in single campus colleges the range was less--from 1.56 for faculty respondents to 2.60 for vice presidents (Table 45). However, differences in status group medians for both multicampus and single campus groups were significant at the .001 level, indicating little effect of organizational type alone on overall status differences (Table 48).

Organizational type did appear to be related to perceptions of numbers of other participants when specific status groups were compared. The median for department chairmen in multicampus colleges was only 1.82 as compared

Table 48. Number Of Other Participants Named By Organizational Type Comparing Status Medians For Multi- and Single Campus

Multicampus

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Faculty	58.33 41	85.67 103	144
Department Chairmen	32.81 31	48.19 50	81
Business Officers	32.81 29	48.19 52	81
Vice Presidents	29.17 36	42.83 36	72
Presidents	21.88 38	32.12 16	54
Total	175	257	432

$X^2 = 32.22 \quad p < .001$

Single Campus

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Faculty	162.30 124	224.70 263	387
Department Chairmen	79.26 91	109.74 98	189
Business Officers	33.97 41	47.03 40	81
Vice Presidents	60.39 75	83.61 69	144
Presidents	49.07 54	67.93 63	117
Total	385	533	918

$X^2 = 28.01 \quad p < .001$

to 2.41 in single campus colleges; the median for business officers in multicampus colleges was 1.78 compared to 2.54 in single campus colleges; and for presidents in multicampus colleges the median was 3.72 as opposed to only 2.37 in single campus colleges. Median numbers of other participants named by faculty and by vice presidents in multicampus colleges were similar to their counterparts in single campus colleges.

Median differences between multicampus and single campus status groups were significant for presidents only ($p < .005$) as shown in Table 49. No differences were found between multicampus and single campus department chairmen nor multicampus and single campus business officers.

By medians for instructional and funding decision groups. Whether the responses were from multicampus or single campus colleges did not appear to make a difference in medians for instructional decisions compared to finding decisions (Table 50). In multicampus colleges, the median for instructional decisions was 2.53 other participants, 1.48 for funding decisions. The instructional decision median for single campus colleges was 2.58 and for funding decisions 1.57. In both types, median differences for instructional decisions compared with funding decisions were significant at the .001 level (Table 51). The tendency by respondents in both

Table 49. Number Of Participants Named Comparing Multicampus And Single Campus Department Chairmen, Business Officers, And Presidents

Department Chairmen

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Multicampus	36.6 31	44.4 50	81
Single Campus	85.4 91	103.6 98	189
Total	122	148	270

$X^2 = 2.23$ $p < .13$

Business Officers

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Multicampus	35 29	46 52	81
Single Campus	35 41	46 40	81
Total	70	92	162

$X^2 = 3.62$ $p < .07$

Presidents

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Multicampus	29.05 38	24.95 16	54
Single Campus	62.95 54	54.05 63	117
Total	92	79	171

$X^2 = 8.72$ $p < .005$

Table 50. Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Organizational Type: Frequency Distributions

Multicampus Colleges

No. Named	Instructional		Funding	
9	6	240	2	192
8	6	234	4	190
7	7	228	5	186
6	16	221	7	181
5	17	205	6	174
4	29	188	13	168
3	40	159	17	155
2	43	119	41	138
1	33	76	42	97
0	43	43	55	55
Median	2.53		1.48	

Single Campus Colleges

No. Named	Instructional		Funding	
9	3	510	1	408
8	1	507	0	407
7	14	506	6	407
6	13	492	14	401
5	53	479	12	387
4	65	426	37	375
3	116	361	50	338
2	94	245	92	288
1	78	151	91	196
0	73	73	105	105
Median	2.58		1.57	

organizational types to attribute more participation to instructional decisions than funding decisions was consistent with medians for all colleges together.

Table 51. Number Of Other Participants Named Comparing Instructional And Funding Decisions By Organizational Type

Multicampus

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Instructional	97.22 121	142.78 119	240
Funding	77.78 54	114.22 138	192
Total	175	257	432

$X^2 = 22.0 \quad p < .001$

Single Campus

	Above Median	Below Median	Total
Instructional	213.89 265	296.11 120	510
Funding	171.11 120	236.89 288	408
Total	385	533	918

$X^2 = 47.33 \quad p < .001$

Summary

Perceptions of five status groups in Florida community colleges as to the identity of the institutional role incumbent with authority to make decisions about curriculum change and other organization members who officially participate in those decisions were presented in this chapter. Responses were compared by status, by college size, by college organization type, and by type of decision. Significant differences were determined by using the Chi-Square Test, the Median Test, and the Extension of the Median Test.

Analysis revealed consistently significant status group differences in perception over all measures with the faculty status group generally differing from all others. College size was related to significant status group differences in several instances. Respondents from small colleges tended to differ more in their response patterns than did medium or large college respondents. In most cases, organization type and decision type did not prove to be related to differences in perceptions.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

In Chapter IV the findings which were reported in the preceding chapter are synthesized and related to the specific questions for study from Chapter I. For clarity and continuity, this chapter is organized to the extent possible on the basis of the questions for study. That is, each question from Chapter I is restated along with an analysis of pertinent data from Chapter III.

Rationale For Analysis

Survey research produces an abundance of data, not all of it directly pertinent to the study. There follows a rationale for the choices made about the data to be analyzed.

As was discussed at some length in Chapter I, the impetus for this study was the result of speculation about the probability, as well as the possibility, of faculty-initiated curriculum change. As the review of theory and expert opinion on the broad subject of change proceeded, it became apparent that one who wished to produce change in a large organization must be prepared to move the organization as well as the individuals who comprise it. (For example, Greiner, 1967, p. 80.) This research focused on the decision-making process in the colleges studied for two major reasons: (1) the generally agreed upon importance to the organization of the decision-making function (p. 16), and (2) the potential accessibility of the decision-making processes to individual influence.

Corson (160) has called decision making "a process in which the ideas, analyses, and factual contributions of many individuals may be assembled for final approval or decision by an executive" (p. 11). Assuming that to be true, it would seem that the individual who wanted to initiate a curriculum change would first need to know who that "executive" might be. And since decision making in organizations is rarely unilateral, it would seem necessary as well to have an idea of those who officially contribute to the making of specific decisions (pp. 20-21).

The basic premise of this study was that perceptions of the identity of the person with authority to decide for the organization (final decision maker) and of the numbers of other persons involved in an official capacity (other participants) would vary by status group. The research questions asked, therefore, were based upon status as the basic unit of comparison.

All Respondents And All Colleges

No study question dealt specifically with overall findings without reference to differences related to status, college size, college organizational type, or decision type. However, such general information was generated by the survey and was included to provide a framework for the specific points studied.

Final Decision Maker

As might have been expected, the president was most frequently identified as the final decision maker when curriculum change or allocation of funds for curriculum change were the decisions in question. Following at some distance were the academic dean and the academic vice president. Together, the three titles were named nearly two-thirds of the time and no other title was chosen more than 6.4% of the time. In spite of the strong suggestion in the literature that faculty tend to make the instructional and curriculum decisions, it would appear that either Florida community colleges are organized very differently or that perceptions about the decision maker with final authority are different from reality. Faculty was named final decision maker only 3.5% of the time; not surprisingly, nearly 90% of the choices of faculty as final decision maker were connected with instructional decisions.

The third most frequent response was "Don't know the final decision-maker," chosen over 10% of the time by all respondents. Such an outcome might have been expected since more than one expert on higher education (Corson, 1975, Blau and Scott, 1962, Gouldner, 1957) found that professional orientation tended to foster ignorance of administrative considerations, especially in the case of non-administrators.

Another insight into perception of respondents regarding the identity of the final decision maker was gained by looking at the numbers of different decision makers named by respondents for each decision. The median number named was 9.63 out of only 13 possible selections. Part of the reason for the wide range in the selection of final decision maker may be accounted for by real differences among colleges as to the person responsible for certain decisions. However, when on the average, less than 3 of the 13 possible choices were not named at least once, there seemed room for speculation that perhaps there were major differences in perception about where final responsibility lies.

Other Participants

The knowledge of persons involved officially in the decision-making processes in a college would seem to be extremely important for anyone who wanted to influence that process. Since organizational decisions are rarely unilateral, officially at least, the percentage of "No other participants" responses was surprisingly large, 20.5% of all responses. Since all data were collected by mail, the possibility exists that the "No others" response was chosen because it was easier than thinking through the steps in decision making to obtain a more accurate count of other participants.

However, it was noteworthy, in light of Blau and Scott's (1962) contention that professional orientation fosters a tendency to ignore administrative considerations (p. 246), that the proportion of "No other" responses were much smaller for administrators than for faculty. It seems plausible to suggest that the large proportion of "No other" responses constitutes a legitimate perception by faculty, at least, of the way decisions are made.

The median number of other participants named for all decisions and all respondents was 2.07. In other words, respondents generally believed that, including the final decision maker, most decisions are made with official input from about three people. Once again, there was a noticeable difference between faculty and administrators in the number of other participants named. The median for faculty was below the common median while the median for all administrative status groups was above. The salient point was that faculty appeared to perceive the decision making process as significantly less participative than did administrators at each level. This generalization was consistent throughout without regard to specific variables tested with the single exception of college size which will be discussed later.

Final Decision Maker--Status Group Comparison

Are perceptions of organization members in different status groups in agreement as to the location of final authority for decisions regarding selected types of curriculum change?

Four comparisons were used to test status group differences: (1) the proportion naming the president final decision maker, (2) the proportion naming the faculty final decision maker, (3) group median for numbers of _different_ final decision makers named, and (4) the proportion responding "Don't know final decision maker." By all measures, significant perceptual differences by status group were found.

While the president was named final decision maker most frequently by every status group, the actual proportion by group varied significantly. Faculty and department chairmen designated the president nearly one-third of the time. Presidents and vice-presidents named the president much more frequently, over half the time, and business officers chose the presidents nearly two-thirds of the time.

The percentage of times the faculty was designated final decision maker was very small for all status groups. However, the differences by status groups were significant just as they were for designation of the president and perhaps even more revealing of lack of perceptual accord. Faculty named faculty only 6.6% of the time, but that was over twice the percentage of department chairmen who did so, and presidents designated the faculty not one single time.

The pattern was similar when medians for numbers of different final decision makers were compared. The median number named by faculty for any decision was 8.63, for department chairmen, there was slightly more agreement at 7.67. Median for central administrators drops significantly to less than 5.33 per decision.

The true significance of those differences lay in the nature of the aggregated data from the 24 colleges included in the study. It was expected that different final decision makers would be designated for each decision since the responsibility for different decisions would likely belong to different persons depending on individual college administrative organization. However, if perceptions at each status level were similar, the median should be similar. Since they were not, it could only mean that there were significant differences by status as to perception about the identity of the final decision maker.

The response "Don't know final decision maker" would seem to indicate the existence of a distinct handicap if the individual so responding ever were interested in initiating a curriculum change. On this measure, faculty responses were significantly different from all other groups. One-fifth of the time, faculty indicated that the final decision maker was unknown to them while less than 5% of responses for the remaining four status groups were in that category. The probability of successful curriculum change initiated by faculty would seem small if 20% of the time, they don't know who will ultimately say "Yes" or "No."

Other Participants--Status Group Comparison

Are perceptions of organizations members in different status groups in agreement as to the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions regarding selected types of curriculum change?

Two comparisons were used to test status group differences: (1) the proportion of "No other participants" responses, and (2) median for numbers of other participants named. Both measures revealed significant status differences.

Faculty indicated "No other participants" nearly one-third of the time and chairmen did so 20.4% of the time, compared to central administrators who so responded less than 10% of the time. Clearly, perception of the number of unilateral decisions is strongly related to status.

Gaining access to official participants in the decision-making process would be one potentially effective way to influence the outcome of a decision. One must, however, have a reasonably accurate idea of who besides the final decision maker may be involved. A position by position analysis of those persons named as participants in decision making was ruled out due to the pooled nature of data analysis in this study. Comparison of perceptions of numbers of other participants to gain insight into the amount of perceived participation was judged more appropriate. On that basis, there are obvious status group differences.

Faculty perceived significantly fewer participants than did all other respondents. Interestingly, whereas on other measures, percentages for department chairmen resemble those of faculty more than other administrators, in this area, department chairmen respond similarly to other administrators. In fact, with a median of 2.25 other participants, department chairmen rank above business officers (median 2.17) in perceived number of other participants. Since the differences in median for the five status groups were highly significant, it would appear that there was a great deal of perceptual difference dependent on status group.

Colleges Grouped By Size

Blau (1973), Corson (1975), Etzioni (1964), and others have observed and/or theorized that size has a pervasive influence on decision-making processes in organizations. Growth normally brings with it changes which affect the way decisions are made, among them longer chains of command, greater communication difficulties, divergent goal orientations, and more external control of resource allocation. Since size has been related to decision making in other well documented studies, it was used as a variable in this study also.

Final Decision Maker--Status Group Comparison

Is the size of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the location of final responsibility for decisions?

When the proportions of respondents naming the president final decision maker were tested by size alone, a significant difference was found. Respondents in small colleges named the president most frequently; those in large colleges least frequently. The pattern was consistent and significant when each status level was compared by size except in the case of presidents. For presidents, no difference was found based on size. Consequently, size appeared to be related to status group differences in the choice of the president as final decision maker in the same way that it was related for all respondents. The single exception was the status group presidents. That group showed no difference based on size in proportions naming the president final decision maker.

Choice of faculty as final decision maker by all respondents was not related to size alone. When status comparisons by size were made, however, the difference between faculty responses and those of all respondents for each size group was significant in large colleges. There faculty named faculty as final decision maker significantly more frequently than all respondents together did.

Size was a significant factor in differences in medians of number of different final decision makers named. When small, medium, and large colleges were compared, the difference was highly significant ($p < .001$). However, comparison of expected frequencies and observed frequencies in individual cells in Table 16 showed that the greatest variance was in small college cells. A further comparison of medium and large colleges disclosed no difference by size for medium and large groups.

"Don't know final decision maker" responses were significantly different for all respondents when analyzed by size. Respondents from small colleges were least likely to respond "Don't know" while large college respondents were more than twice as likely to indicate ignorance of the final decision maker.

Status comparisons within size groups also showed differences based on size. Faculty responded "Don't know" significantly more often than expected in medium and large colleges, in small colleges there was no difference between faculty and all respondents. Similarly, when faculty "Don't know" responses were compared by size, small faculty were much less likely and medium faculty somewhat less likely than expected to respond "Don't know." Large college faculty, however, were much more likely to so respond than expected.

Generally, there was evidence that size does indeed make a difference in perceptions of the decision-making process. Small size especially seemed related to smaller differences in perception.

Other Participants--Status Group Comparison

Is the size of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the number of persons who are involved in decisions?

"No other participants" responses compared by size alone revealed a significant difference based on size. Small college respondents indicated there were no other participants far less frequently than did respondents in medium and large colleges. The pattern for status groups compared by size was similar to the pattern for all respondents. That is, small college status groups taken individually responded "No other" less frequently than did comparable groups in medium and large colleges. Large college faculty, department chairmen, and business officers, like all respondents in large colleges, responded "No others" far more frequently than their small and medium college counterparts. Only presidents and vice presidents responded differently when size was considered.

For those status groups, the largest proportion of "No others" responses were in medium, not large, colleges.

Size alone did not appear to be a factor in numbers of other participants named. Comparison of medians for all respondents for small, medium, and large colleges indicated no difference by size. Some status differences by size were observed, however. While no differences based on size were found for department chairmen, business officers and vice presidents, there was a significant difference when faculty medians were compared by size. Small college faculty named more other participants and large college faculty named fewer. Medians for presidents compared by size were significantly different also but in the opposite order from faculty. Presidents in small colleges named the fewest other participants while presidents in large colleges named the most.

Size alone appeared to be related to "No other participants" responses but was not particularly a factor in number of other participants named. When status groups were compared by size, "No others" responses for status groups were similar to those based on size alone. Size did appear to be a factor in status group differences in number of other participants named for faculty and presidents.

Colleges Grouped By Organizational Type

In order better to serve their communities, many community colleges have established branch campuses. In Florida, multicampus colleges have as few as two to as many as five separate campuses. Administrative organization patterns vary, but generally each campus has its own top administrator, usually with the title of provost or dean, and its own central administrative staff. Since the multicampus arrangement is in decided contrast to the more traditional single-site community college, the relationship of organizational type differences in perceptions was explored in this study.

Final Decision Maker--Status Group Comparison

Is the organizational type of the institution, i.e., multicampus or single campus, related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the location of final responsibility for decisions?

Organizational type alone was not related to perceptions by all respondents of the president as final decision maker. Respondents in multicampus colleges named the president 42.2% of the time, in single campus colleges 41.9%. Likewise, status group responses showed no difference by organizational type with the single exception of department chairmen. Chairmen in single campus colleges named the president significantly more often than did multicampus chairmen. However, within groups there was no difference between responses for chairmen compared to all respondents.

Responses naming faculty as final decision maker were not different either by organizational type alone nor by status groups compared to type, again with the exception of department chairmen. Single campus chairmen were more likely than multicampus chairmen to name the faculty final decision maker.

Numbers of different final decision makers named were significantly different depending on organizational type. Comparison of medians revealed that multicampus respondents named fewer different final decision makers than did respondents in single campus colleges. Status group comparisons also showed significant differences by type for faculty, department chairmen, and presidents. For each of the three status groups, respondents in single campus colleges named more different final decision makers than did their counterparts in multicampus colleges. Apparently, multicampus organization does not increase communications difficulties, at least regarding the identity of the final decision maker. Or possibly, control is decentralized to the individual campus so that they function much as small independent colleges.

Organizational type alone was not a significant factor in the tendency of respondents to answer "Don't know final decision maker." There was also no difference by type when faculty responses were compared to all "Don't know" responses within groups. In such case, faculty were more likely, at a highly significant level, to indicate ignorance of the identity of the final decision maker than were all respondents. However, when faculty groups were directly compared by organizational type, multicampus faculty responded "Don't know" far more frequently than single campus faculty.

Organizational type alone appeared to be a factor in perceptions of the final decision maker only when medians for numbers of different final decision makers were considered. Type also appeared to be related to certain status differences, contradictorily so in one instance. Comparison by status for numbers of different final decision makers named showed multicampus faculty displaying fewer perceptual differences about the final decision maker than faculty in single campus colleges. At the same time, faculty in multicampus colleges were much more likely to indicate that they did not know who the final decision maker was than single campus faculty.

Number of Participants--Status Group Comparison

Is the organizational type of institution, i.e., multicampus or single campus, related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions?

The tendency to respond "No other participants" was not related to organizational size alone since proportions of both groups so responding were similar. When status groups were compared by organizational type, no differences related to type were found. Within group status differences were significant at the .001 level for both organizational types. In each case, faculty responded "No others" much more frequently and all other status groups less frequently than expected. Status comparisons between groups likewise showed no type differences except in the case of business officers. Multicampus business officers were far more likely to respond "No others" than those in single campus institutions.

Median numbers of other participants for all respondents showed no difference by organizational type, either. Again, comparison of status groups by type, while indicating significant status differences within type groups, revealed no difference based on organizational type. Status differences were significant at the same level for both multicampus and single campus colleges. When status groups were compared directly by organizational type, no differences were found for any status group except presidents. They differed significantly, with multicampus presidents naming far more other participants than single campus presidents.

Generally, organizational type made no difference in responses about number of other participants in decision making. Status differences noted were within group differences (with the exception of presidents and business officers as noted above) and were similar for both organizational types.

Comparison By Type of Decision

One of the basic assumptions in the design state of this research was the existence of the necessity for two distinct decisions connected with every curriculum change. Not only must the substance of the proposal be studied and its merits determined, but a decision must also be made to allocate institutional funds for its support. It is a matter of general belief that curriculum decisions are group decisions with input from many different sources and that funding decisions tend to be made by the keeper of the budget--an academic dean or vice president perhaps.

The questionnaire was designed to allow a comparison of decisions that are primarily instructional with decisions that deal primarily with funding. Odd-numbered questions were instructional in nature; even-numbered were funding questions.

Number of Different Final Decision Makers Named

Is the type of decision related to perceptions of organization members regarding the location of final responsibility for decisions?

When median numbers of different final decision makers named by all respondents in all colleges were compared, no difference was found. There was no more consensus about the identity of the decision maker who allocates the funds than there was about the curriculum decision maker. Size also made no difference. Medians by size group for instructional and funding decisions were virtually the same. Interestingly, in medium colleges, there was slightly less consensus about the identity of the final decision maker for funding decisions than for instructional decisions. Likewise, organizational type was not a factor in median differences between instructional and funding decisions.

Apparently, the holder of authority to allocate money for curriculum change is as much a matter for conjecture as is the identity of the curriculum decision maker.

Number of Other Participants Named

Is the type of decision related to perceptions of organization members regarding the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions?

For all respondents in all colleges, the median number of other participants named for instructional decisions was significantly more than the median for funding decisions. In fact, 26.8% of respondents perceived no participation in funding decisions. When comparisons based on size were made, the results were essentially the same. Median differences were significant for all size groups, although in small colleges the difference was significant at .05 rather than .001 as it was for medium and large colleges. When the two types of decisions were compared by organizational type, significant differences were again found within groups but not between groups. Therefore, organizational type appears not to be related to differences.

It would seem that respondents, while they cannot decide who the final decision maker is, nonetheless perceive him/her to be making funding decisions with far less input from others than has the curriculum decision maker.

Summary

Research findings reported in Chapter II were analyzed in the context of the specific questions for study introduced in Chapter I. Results of comparisons by research variable were synthesized and their implications discussed.

The major finding had to do with status group comparisons, specifically the consistent difference between faculty perceptions and those of all other status groups by all measures. Another important finding was that, while college size was frequently related to perceptual differences, organizational type and decision type were infrequently related to differences.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V includes a summary of study results, conclusions and implications, and recommendations for further research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to ascertain perceptions of professional educators in Florida community colleges relative to two aspects of decision making as applied to curriculum change: (1) decisions which have to do with the curriculum or instructional aspects of the change, and (2) decisions which have to do primarily with fund allocation to support a proposed change. The thrust of the study was to determine whether perceptual differences existed among educators grouped by status: faculty, department chairmen, business officers, academic vice presidents, and presidents.

The study was organized around specific questions developed from the problem statement. For clarity and convenience, the summary is also organized around those questions.

1. Are perceptions of organization members in different status groups in agreement as to the location of final authority for decisions regarding selected types of curriculum change?

The existence of perceptual differences based on status was the major significant finding in the study. No matter the measure, status differences were consistently revealed. Faculty perceptions about the final decision maker were uniformly different from those of all other status groups. When asked to name the holder of final decision-making authority, by all measures faculty responses showed significantly less agreement of perception than all other respondents as to who was responsible. Generally, but not entirely consistently, the largest difference was between perceptions of faculty and perceptions of presidents. Among administrators, perceptions as to the locus of authority tended to be similar by status group on all measures with the exception of department chairmen, whose responses resembled other administrators by some measures and faculty by other measures.

2. Are perceptions of organization members in different status groups in agreement as to the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions regarding selected types of curriculum change?

Again, perceptual differences, not agreement, by status were found. Faculty as a group perceived significantly fewer participants than all other status groups.

Faculty was also much more likely to indicate that no one except the final decision maker was involved in decisions. Once again, all administrator status groups tended to respond similarly with the exception of department chairmen. Their responses as to numbers of other participants were like those of other administrators, yet chairmen were far more likely than other administrators to indicate no participation in decisions.

3. Is the size of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the location of final authority for decisions?

Next to status, size was found to be related to more perceptual differences about the identity of the final decision maker than any other variable. Generally, small size was associated with fewer numbers of final decision makers named and with smaller status group differences in perception. Conversely, but not as consistently, large size was associated with greater perceptual differences, especially between faculty and all other status groups.

4. Is the size of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the number of persons who are involved in decisions?

The relationship of size to perceptions of other participants in decision making was not consistent for both measures. It appeared to be strongly related to "No other participants" response patterns since small college respondents all together and by status group comparisons tended to respond "No others" significantly less frequently than those in medium and large colleges. College size alone did not prove to be related to the number of other participants named. It was, however, strongly related to status group differences. Small college faculty named significantly more and small college presidents named significantly fewer other participants than their counterparts in medium and large colleges. Additionally, large college faculty named significantly fewer and large college presidents significantly more other participants than their counterparts in other size groups.

In other words, status differences in perceptions about numbers of other participants were emphasized when colleges were compared by size. In small colleges perceptions of faculty were significantly different from those of presidents as they were in medium and large colleges, but in precisely the opposite direction. Small college faculty perceived more participation in decision making than did presidents and other administrators in small colleges, while in large and medium colleges, faculty perceived significantly fewer participants than did administrators.

5. Is the organizational type, i.e., single campus or multicampus, of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the location of final authority for decisions?

With one or two exceptions, organizational type did not prove to be a factor in perceptions of the identity of the final decision maker. Organizational type was related to differences in numbers of different final decision makers named, both for all respondents and by status groups. Multicampus respondents all together named significantly fewer different final decision makers than did respondents in single campus colleges. The same was true of status group faculty, department chairmen, and presidents. Otherwise, no difference based on organizational type was found.

6. Is the organizational type of the institution related to perceptions of organization members in different status groups regarding the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions?

Organization type was not related to numbers of other participants named except in the case of presidents. Multicampus presidents named significantly more other participants than did single campus presidents. Faculty differences were not related to type. In both multicampus and single campus colleges faculty differed significantly from other status groups, but the direction of differences was the same. That is, faculty in both organizational type groups perceived fewer participants than other status groups.

7. Is the type of decision, curriculum or funding, related to perceptions or organization members regarding the location of final responsibility for decisions?

Type of decision, curriculum or funding, was not related to perceptions of participants about the identity of the final decision maker. This was true for all respondents in all colleges, for all respondents in colleges compared by size, and for all respondents in colleges compared by organizational type.

8. Is the type of decision, curriculum or funding, related to perceptions of organization members regarding the number of persons or groups who are involved in decisions?

The type of decision was related to perceptions of numbers of other participants. Curriculum decisions were perceived to involve significantly more input from other participants than funding decisions. This was true whether the comparison was for all respondents in all colleges, for all respondents by college size, or for all respondents by organizational type.

Conclusions and Implications

As data analysis proceeded, it was apparent that the study had become essentially an investigation of the truth of the common belief that large organizations have communications difficulties. The unvarying consistency of differences in perceptions between faculty respondents and all other respondents, except occasionally in small colleges, seemed to present strong evidence that "what A sees vividly, B cannot comprehend at all," and that the problem grows with the size of the institution.

The nature of perceptual differences between faculty and all others was of some interest, also. To begin with, faculty members appear to know less about decision making in their colleges, as evidenced by their greater tendency to indicate that they did not know the identity of the final decision maker and, in essence, to indicate that many decisions are made unilaterally. The study was not designed to determine actual decision-making procedures, so for isolated items it would be inappropriate to suggest that one group was right in its beliefs and another wrong. But in this case, there is a consistent pattern of faculty responses differing from all others which would seem to suggest misperception by faculty members rather than just differences.

The role of size and organizational type in perceptual differences was also of special interest. Small size was fairly consistently associated with smaller or no status group differences; large size to a lesser extent was associated with large status differences in perceptions. Such findings seem to support the common belief that serious flaws in communications become more common as institutions grow in size.

The lack of association on most measures between single campus and multicampus organization was an unexpected finding. One would expect physical distance itself to create a communications barrier. Since it appears that it does not, it is possible to speculate that some part of the status group differences in perception indeed may be psychological in origin; that is, a product of differing idiographic needs and orientations to the organization. This is an especially attractive proposition given the much more consistent association between size and variations in perceptual differences among status groups. Lack of status group perceptual differences in small colleges could conceivably be due, in part, to the community of interest possible in small, but not in large, institutions as Corson (1960) suggested. The fact that organizational type was not a factor would tend to support that notion.

Recommendation

Survey research conducted by mail is attended by several weaknesses, one of the greatest of which is the inability of the researcher to clarify and expand questions for the respondents. Consequently, there is always danger of misinterpretation of questionnaire items. It is therefore suggested that future related studies could be designed to check the accuracy in individual institutions of the results of aggregated data by using an on-site research technique.

Since only perceptual information was gathered in this study, there is no empirical evidence as to the relationship of perceptual differences about decision making to actual decision-making processes. A second recommendation for future investigation, then, would be that actual decision-making procedures in all or some of the same colleges be described to provide a basis for comparing perceptions with reality.

Great differences in perceptions among status groups strongly suggest that, whatever the reality of decision-making processes, there are still communications and information dissemination problems in many of the colleges studied. The third recommendation for future research suggested by the study would be research designed to investigate the nature of those problems and, further, to suggest methods for overcoming them.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTERS

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
gainesville, florida - 32611

April 20, 1979

Dear Colleague:

Mrs. Sandra Scaggs, a doctoral student in higher education administration, is carrying out a research study in the area of decision-making processes related to the implementation of curriculum change in Florida community colleges. The participation of selected administrators and faculty is being requested for the purpose of collecting data for the study.

The attached questionaire should take no more than a few minutes of your time since the information requested deals with your perceptions of the curriculum change process and makes no attempt to determine the actual facts. Since the data being collected are perceptual in nature, it is especially important that each respondent personally complete the questionnaire and return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than May 7.

I appreciate your cooperation in this study. If you would like a summary of the results, please so indicate on the enclosed card which you may return separately to me if you wish.

Cordially,

Jim Wattenbarger

James L. Wattenbarger
Director, Institute
of Higher Education

JLW:amp
encls.

The purpose of this study is to determine who are the participants in important institutional curriculum decisions. Please respond to all items since your perspective regarding each is the important information sought. Please do not identify yourself in any way. This will assure complete confidentiality of response. The questionnaire is coded by institution and position for follow-up and data-analysis purposes only.

Sandra W. Scaggs
James L. Wattenbarger
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Decision Points

In completing this form, please answer each question in terms of your own understanding of the decision-making process. The same two questions are asked about each decision item.

A. Who makes the final decision?
Identify the one person who is finally responsible for making this decision by placing an "X" by the appropriate title.

B. Who else is involved in making this decision?
Identify any other persons who are officially involved in making this decision by placing an "O" by the appropriate titles.

X--final decision-maker

O--others officially involved

1. The decision to create a new credit course.

_____President
_____Institutional Academic Vice President
_____Chief Business Officer
_____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
_____Institutional Curriculum Committee
_____Chief Campus Administrator
_____Campus Academic Vice President
_____Academic Dean
_____Campus Curriculum Committee
_____Division Chairperson
_____Department Chairperson
_____Faculty Peers
_____Don't Know

2. The decision to fund a new credit course.

_____President
_____Institutional Academic Vice President
_____Chief Business Officer
_____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
_____Institutional Curriculum Committee
_____Chief Campus Administrator
_____Campus Academic Vice President
_____Academic Dean
_____Campus Curriculum Committee
_____Division Chairperson
_____Department Chairperson
_____Faculty Peers
_____Don't Know

X--final decision maker

O--others officially involved

3. The decision to change the content of a credit course.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

4. The decision to fund the change of content of a credit course.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

5. The decision to create a new non-credit course.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

6. The decision to fund a new non-credit course.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

X--final decision maker

O--others officially involved

7. The decision to change the delivery system for a course; i.e., interdisciplinary modules.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

8. The decision to fund a change in the delivery system for a course.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

9. The decision to change graduation requirements.

____President
____Institutional Academic Vice President
____Chief Business Officer
____Institutional Curriculum Coordinator
____Institutional Curriculum Committee
____Chief Campus Administrator
____Campus Academic Vice President
____Academic Dean
____Campus Curriculum Committee
____Division Chairperson
____Department Chairperson
____Faculty Peers
____Don't Know

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
gainesville, florida - 32611

May 16, 1979

Dear Colleague:

About three weeks ago you were mailed a questionnaire connected with a study being conducted for the Institute of Higher Education by Mrs. Sandra Scaggs. We have not yet received your response, so on the assumption that the questionnaire may have been lost in the mails, or inadvertently misplaced, I am enclosing another packet for your use.

Would you please take a few moments right now to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. We feel this will be a very worthwhile study for helping to make future decisions. Your assistance in this study is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Jim Wattenbarger

James L. Wattenbarger
Director, Institute
of Higher Education

JLS:amp
enc.

APPENDIX B
COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Brevard Community College
Broward Community College
Central Florida Community College
Chipola Junior College
Daytona Beach Community College
Edison Community College
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville
Florida Keys Community College
Gulf Coast Community College
Hillsborough Community College
Indian River Community College
Lake City Community College
Lake-Sumter Community College
Manatee Junior College
Miami-Dade Community College
North Florida Junior College
Okaloosa-Walton Junior College
Palm Beach Junior College
Pasco-Hernando Community College
Pensacola Junior College
Polk Community College
St. Johns River Community College
St. Petersburg Junior College
Santa Fe Community College
Seminole Community College
South Florida Junior College
Tallahassee Community College
Valencia Community College

Colleges Divided by Size

Small (under 1500 FTE)

Chipola Junior College
North Florida Junior College
St. Johns River Community College
South Florida Junior College

Medium (1500 - 5000 FTE)

Central Florida Community College
Edison Community College
Florida Keys Community College
Gulf Coast Community College
Lake City Community College
Lake-Sumter Community College
Manatee Junior College
Okaloosa-Walton Junior College
Pasco-Hernando Community College
Polk Community College
Seminole Community College
Tallahassee Community College

Large (over 5000 FTE)

Brevard Community College
Broward Community College
Daytona Beach Community College
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville
Hillsborough Community College
Indian River Community College
Miami-Dade Community College
Palm Beach Junior College
Pensacola Junior College
St. Petersburg Junior College
Santa Fe Community College
Valencia Community College

Colleges Divided by Organizational Type

Multicampus

Brevard Community College
Broward Community College
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville
Hillsborough Community College
Miami-Dade Community College
Palm Beach Junior College
Pasco-Hernando Community College
St. Petersburg Junior College
Valencia Community College

Single Campus

Central Florida Community College
Chipola Junior College
Daytona Beach Community College
Edison Community College
Florida Keys Community College
Gulf Coast Community College
Indian River Community College
Lake City Community College
Lake-Sumter Community College
Manatee Junior College
North Florida Junior College
Okaloosa-Walton Junior College
Pensacola Junior College
Polk Community College
St. Johns River Community College
Santa Fe Community College
Seminole Community College
South Florida Junior College
Tallahassee Community College

REFERENCES

Anderson, J.G. Bureaucracy in education. Baltimore, MD.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

Argyris, C. Personality and organization. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Bakke, E.W. Organization and the individual. New Haven, Conn.: Labor & Management Center, Yale University, 1952.

Bakke, E.W., & Argyris, C. Organizational structural and dynamics: A framework for theory. New Haven, Conn.: Labor & Management Center, Yale University, 1954.

Baldridge, J.V. Power and conflict in the university. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

Barnard, C.I. The functions of the executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bartley, S.H. Principles of perception, 2nd Ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Bennis, W.G. Changing organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Blau, P.M. The organization of academic work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

Blau, P.M., & Scott, R.W. Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Bridges, E.M. Administrative man: Origin or pawn in decision making? Educational Administration Quarterly, 1970, 6, 7-25.

Brubaker, D.L., & Nelson, R.H., Jr. Creative survival in educational bureaucracies. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974.

Carlson, R.O. Barriers to change in public schools. In R.O. Carlson, A. Gallaher, M.B. Miles, & R.J. Pellegrin (Eds.), Change processes in the public schools. Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon Press, 1965.

Clark, T.N. Institutionalization of innovations in higher education: Four models. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1968, 13, 1-25.

Corson, J.J. Governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Corson, J.J. Governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Dill, W.R. Administrative decision-making. In S. Mallick & E.H. Van Ness (Eds.), Concepts and issues in administrative behavior, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Drucker, P.F. The age of discontinuity. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Drucker, P.F. Management. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Eichholz, G., & Rogers, E.M. Resistance to the adoption of audiovisual aids by elementary school teachers: Contrasts and similarities to agricultural innovation. In M.B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Etzioni, A. Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-hall, 1964.

Eye, G.G., Gregg, R.T., Lipham, J.M., Netzer, L.A., & Francke, D.C. Relationship between institutional change and the extent to which school administrators and teachers agree on the location of responsibilities for administrative decisions. OE Cooperative Research Project No. 5-0443 (1913). Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Fayol, H. [General and industrial management] (C. Storrs, trans.). London: Pitman & Sons, 1949.

Feldman, J., & Kanter, H.E. Organizational decision making. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Ferguson, G.A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Flanagan, D. Policy formulation: An analysis of organizational decision-making styles. Planning and changing, 1976, 7, 113-120.

Follett, M.P. Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett (H.C. Metcalf & L. Urwick, Eds.). New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940

Fox, D.J. The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Funk & Wagnall's Standard College Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnall, 1975.

Getzels, J.W., & Guba, E.G. Social behavior and the administrative process. The School Review, 1957, 65, 423-441.

Gouldner, A.W. Cosmopolitans and locals. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1957, 2, 281-306.

Greiner, L.E. Patterns of organizational change. Harvard Business Review, 1967, 45, 119-130.

Griffiths, D.E. Administrative theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Griffiths, D.E. Administrative theory and change in organizations. In M. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Griffiths, D.E. A taxonomy based on decision-making. In D.E. Griffiths (Ed.), Developing a taxonomy of organizational behavior in educational administration. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J.B., & Bernstein, M. Implementing organizational innovations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Hays, W.L. Statistics for psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Hefferlin, J.B. Dynamics of academic reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Hobbs, D.J. Rural sociology. Theory Into Practice, 1966, 5, 20-24.

Huse, E.F. Organization development and change. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing, 1975.

Iannacconne, L. An approach to the informal organization of the school. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 1964, 63, 223-242.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. The social psychology of organitions. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Lawrence, P.R. How to deal with resistance to change. Harvard Business Review, 1954, 32, 49-57.

Lewin, K. Group decision and social change. In T. Newcomb & E.L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1947.

March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

McCamy, J.L. An analysis of the process of decision making. Public Administration Review, 1947, 7, 41-47.

Mellor, W.L. Structure and rationality in educational information-decision systems. Journal of Educational Administration, 1976, 14, 119-124.

Miles, M.B. Innovation in education: Some generalizations. In M.B. Miles, (Ed.), Innovations in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Millett, J.D. Decision making and administration in higher education. Columbus, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968.

Mort, P.R. Educational adaptability. A reprint of a series of articles appearing in School Executive in 1953-54. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954.

Mort, P.R., & Ross, D.H. Principles of school administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Nation, Muriel A. Curriculum change associated with participation in personal and family finance workshops (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29, 172A. (University Microfilms No. 68-09547).

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H. Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Oliver, A.I. Curriculum improvement. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1965.

Parsons, T. Introduction. [The theory of social and economic organization] (T. Parsons, Ed., A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, trans.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Richman, B.M., & Farmer, R.M. Leadership, goals, and power in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. Management and the worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Robbins, S.P. The administrative process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Rogers, E.M. Diffusion of innovations. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Ross, D.H. Administration for adaptability. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

Seigel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Simon, H.A. Administrative behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1947.

Smith, O.B., Stanley, W.O., & Shores, J.H. Fundamentals of curriculum development. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World Book, 1950.

Taylor, F.W. The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper, 1942.

Waldo, D. Theory of organization: Status and problems. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), Readings on modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Wattenbarger, J.L. & Scaggs, S.W. Curriculum revision and the process of change. New directions for community colleges, 1979, 25, 1-10.

Weber, M. [The theory of social and economic organization] (T. Parsons, Ed., A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, trans.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Webster's Seventh New College Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1971.

Whyte, W.F. Toward an integrated approach for research in organizational behavior. In P. Weissenberg (Ed.), Introduction to organizational behavior. Scranton, Penn.: Intext Educational Publications, 1971.

Wilson, J.Q. Innovation in organization: Notes toward a theory. In J.M. Thomas & W.G. Bennis (Eds.) The management of change and conflict. Baltimore, MD.: Penguin books, 1972.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Sandra Wineland Scaggs was born September 1, 1937, in Dallas Center, Iowa, the eldest of four children of her parents Lela Hart and H. Dale Wineland. She has been married since 1963 to James Lewis Scaggs of Lake Wales, Florida, and they have two children, Dale Wade (Sam) and Shawn Hillary.

Sandra attended Dallas Center public schools until she was graduated in 1955. She then attended Orlando Junior College in Orlando, Florida, for one year before transferring to Murray State College (Kentucky) where she completed her Bachelor of Arts degree in English in 1960. Her master's degree in vocational education was conferred by Florida State University in 1975, the same year she began work on the doctorate in higher education administration.

She taught English, German and journalism at the secondary level in the public schools of Kentucky and Florida for seven years, worked for the Florida Legislature one year as a session employee, and held various graduate assistantships while obtaining her master's and doctoral degrees.

While in high school, she was active in sports, particularly basketball, vocal music and drama groups, and journalistic activities such as the school paper and the yearbook. In college she was a member and vice president of Lambda Iota Tau, a national literary fraternity, and reporter and features editor for the *College News*. She was initiated into Omicron Delta Kappa in 1978 and is currently a member and former chapter vice president of Phi Delta Kappa.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James L Wattenbarger

James L. Wattenbarger, Chairman
Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James A. Hale

James A. Hale
Associate Professor of Educational Administration and
Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Kern Alexander
Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James Hensel
Professor of Instructional
Leadership and Support

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

March, 1980

Dean, Graduate School